Order Number 9211708

Pratibhā: The concept of intuition in the philosophy of Abhinavagupta

Kuanpoonpol, Priyawat, Ph.D.

Harvard University, 1991

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

THESIS ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE

(To be placed in Original Copy)

The undersigned, appointed by the

Division

Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies

Committee

have examined a thesis entitled

Pratibhā: The Concept of Intuition in the Philosophy of Abhinavagupta

presented by Priyawat Kuanpoonpol

candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and hereby certify that it is worthy of acceptance.

Signature M. Witzel

Typed name Michael Witzel

Signature James W. Benson

Typed name James W. Benson

Signature Gary Tubb

Typed name Gary Tubb

Date October 3, 1991

Pratibhā : The Concept of Intuition in the Philosophy of Abhinavagupta

A thesis presented

by

Priyawat Kuanpoonpol

to

The Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the subject of

Sanskrit and Indian Studies

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

October 1991

Pratibhā: The Concept of Intuition
in the Philosophy of Abhinavagupta.

An Abstract

This dissertation is a study of Abhinavagupta's concept of intuition, with particular attention to its role in an aesthetic experience. In this study, the philosopher's synthesis of this concept is traced to three traditions of his intellectual heritage. The grammarian Bhartṛhari's treatment of intuition in the *Vākyapadīya* provides the groundwork for defining the creative role of language in cognition. The Śaiva religious philosophy uses the concept of intuition in forwarding the idea that a subject is free and independent in thought, and that the subject, like God, Śiva, is a unity of consciousness. A human forms mental images out of the spirit and will to know and act. Ānandavardhana in poetics also advances the theory of *rasadhvani* ("Suggestion of Sentiments") in which the poet, possessing intuition and using suggestion in poetic language, can devise original, mood-evoking poems. Abhinava combines these meanings in his concept of intuition which, in the largest sense, is consciousness's verbal immanence unfolding from a partless homogeneity into diverse, perceptible phenomena. In Abhinava's explanation of an aesthetic experience, the concept of intuition underlies the unity of the imaginative enterprise that is an aesthetic continuum comprising the whole of the theater--the poet, actor, and audience. This unity in turn gives the theater its peculiar aesthetic modality and coherence, beginning with a desire to enjoy oneself and ending in the relishing of a *rasa*, an aesthetic mood. Ramifications of intuition as a valid means of knowledge are discussed in the concluding remarks. Descriptions of different aspects of intuition are made with specific references to his intellectual sources: Bhartṛhari in language theory, Utpaladeva in the Śaiva theory of cognition, and Ānandavardhana in poetics.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

Abh	*Abhinavabhāratī*
AE	*Aesthetic Experience According to Abhinavagupta*
AR	*Aesthetic Rapture: the Rasādhyāya of the Nāṭyaśāstra*
ĀSS	Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series
Bh	*Bhartṛhari : A Study of the Vākyapadīya in the Light of the Ancient Commentaries*
Dhā	*Dhvanyāloka*
DhāL	*Dhvanyālokalocana*
DCMS	Deccan College Monograph Series
HOS	Harvard Oriental Series
HSP	*History of Sanskrit Poetics*
IP	*Indian Poetics*
IPK	*Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā*
IPKv	*Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikāvṛtti*
IPV	*Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī*
IPVV	*Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī*
KA	*Kāvyālaṃkāra*
KĀ	*Kāvyādarśa*
KASS	*Kāvyālaṃkārasārasaṃgraha*
KSS	Kashmir Sanskrit Series
KSTS	Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies
NŚ	*Nāṭyaśāstra*
RT	*Rājataraṅginī*
TĀ	*Tantrāloka*
TS	*Tantrasāra*
SBE	Sacred Books of the East
ŚD	*Śivadṛṣṭi*
SK	*Spandakārikā*
ŚS	*Śivasūtra*
VP	*Vākyapadīya*
VSS	Vidyābhavan Sanskrit Series (Chowkhamba)
YS	*Yogasūtra*

Chapter 1

Introduction

In the few centuries before Abhinavagupta's lifetime (late 10th to 11th century), a number of distinguished works were composed by the scholars and poets of Kashmir. Although Kalhaṇa's history does not give us specific accounts of their achievements, it can be inferred from works in poetics and philosophy that partisans of various schools of thought were actively engaged in fruitful debates. A vital affluence of the kingdom also encouraged a high degree of intellectual intercourse, resulting in critical and theoretical innovations that come down to us in a wealth of treatises, notably in the areas of literature, poetics, Śaiva philsophy, and grammar.[1] We observe that several authors were learned not only in the confines of their own fields, but that their interests in peripheral areas added syncretic insights to their proper endeavors.

Abhinava was an intellectual whose many interests, far from being fragmented, converged in a core of beliefs that formed a characteristic, philosophical outlook. One such central view is his concept of intuition, or

[1] Georg Bühler, "Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Mss. Made in Kaśmīr, Rajputana, and Central India," *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1877: Extra number (vol. 34).

pratibhā. In the dissertation, I have mapped out a strategy of focusing on Abhinava's treatment of this concept in aesthetics, drawing on his knowledge in various disciplines to describe it in that context. By tracing the intellectual sources that contribute to his delineation of the notion of aesthetic intuition and by demonstrating how he shapes the structure of an aesthetic perception, I show that the model of the aesthetic structure depends on a general theory of cognition in Śaiva religious philsophy. Since, according to Śaivism, cognition is produced by the homogeneous consciousness in one basic way and in being produced implies a particular relationship of the subject, object, and experience, the structure of various kinds of experience is fundamentally the same, differing only as modalities of consciousness.

The idea of intuition (*pratibhā*) is traditionally treated in passing in Indian philosophy, with the exception of the Sāṃkhya and Śaṅkara's Advaitavedānta systems. Intuition, as a means of knowledge, unaided by the input of a sensory perception and occurring through a sense-contact with its object, is not considered valid. Intuitions of morally perfected individuals, however, are sources of saintly, revealed knowledge (*arṣajñāna*) that is the basis of scriptural authoritativeness.[2] The reasoning is that such extraordinary persons, seers (*ṛṣi*s), exist in reality itself and know it directly without an intermediary of the senses. Vedic seers and poets, for example, are said to have a special wisdom or insight (*dhī*) through which they receive direct knowledge from the divine. This insight gives them an immediate knowledge of reality which they sing out in

[2] Gopinath Kaviraj, "The Doctrine of *Pratibhā* in Indian Philosophy," *ABORI* 5 (1924): part I, 1-18, part II 113-132.

the verses of Vedic hymns.[3] This connection between extraordinary cognitive and poetic powers as conceived by Vedic poets is maintained in the later literary tradition which attributes a poet's genius to his *pratibhā*. It is the insight and inspiration capable of immortalizing human deeds in an imperishable beauty of poetry.[4]

Abhinava was at a historically advantageous point where a few centuries before Utpaladeva had articulated a rigorous system of Śaiva philosophy and Ānandavardhana brought out his revolutionary theory of the suggestion of an aesthetic sentiment (*rasadhvani*) in poetics. Both predecessors of Abhinava relied substantially on Bhartṛhari's theory of language and consciousness in formulating and systematizing their theories.

In the Śaiva theory of cognition, knowledge is seen to be subjectively produced by an agent who is independent and sovereign in his mental construction. Each thought is a fresh and new creation on the part of

---

[3] Jan Gonda, "*Dhīḥ* in the Ṛgveda," and "*Pratibhā*," chs. 2 and 15 in *The Vision of the Vedic Poets* (1st Indian edition, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1984), pp. 68-169, 318-348.

[4] A clear example can be seen in Kalhaṇa, the author of the history of Kashmir who thinks of himself as a poet because of his truth-telling capacity. See Stein, M. A., tr. *The Rājataraṅgiṇī: A Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir,* (*RTR*) vol. 1 (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, Repr. 1979, 1st ed. 1900), verses 1.3-5, 7, pp. 1-2.

"I. 3. Worthy of praise is that power of true poets, whatever it may be, which surpasses even the stream of nectar, in as much as by it their own bodies of glory as well as those of others obtain immortality. 4. Who else but poets resembling Prajapatis [in creative powers] and able to bring forth lovely productions, can place the past times before the eyes of men? 5. If the poet did not see in his mind's eye the existences which he is to reveal to all men, what other indication would there be of his possessing divine intuition [*pratibhā*]? 7. The noble-minded [poet] is alone worthy of praise whose word, like that of a judge, keeps free from love or hatred in relating the facts of the past."

consciousness whose intuition, tinged by ideas of empirical things, verbally determines a cognition. In poetics, the theory of suggestion postulates that poetic language functions in revealing such meanings that, when perceived by a sympathetic reader, leads him/her to realize an aesthetic sentiment, i.e., a *rasa*. Ānanda encourages the poet, who is a god-like creator in the literary realm, to use the suggestive function of language and to exercise his *pratibhā* in order to compose novel and original works. Abhinava comments on the major works of these two predecessors. The *vimarśinī* and the *vivṛtivimarśinī* are commentaries to Utpala's *Pratyabhijñākārikā* and *Pratyabhijñāvṛtti* respectively, and the *Locana* to Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka*.

Abhinava's use of the term *pratibhā* combines cognitive and aesthetic aspects of creativity: the subjective freedom fundamental to every cognition is not different from imaginative and emotive powers in poetic language. Abhinava attributes a creative intuition to the sensitive audience as well as to the poet, and in that way he systematically defines a continuum of aesthetic experience, i.e., the theater, as an expanse of common imagination spun out of the intuitive power of the poet and responded to by the same in the audience. Their common bond is the language of poetry that spellbinds the spectators to a world brought forth in the poet's imaginings.

Combining literary criticism with religious philosophy, Abhinava conceives of the poet's intuition as the noumenous substance of the mind-made world. The poet is like God who plays at painting the universe on the screen that is Himself. The sympathetic spectators, exercising their intuitions in commonly experiencing the pleasures of drama, are akin to

creatures (*jīva*, *paśu*) who reflect God's universe in their everyday consciousnesses. Thus, in Abhinava's poetics, theatrical unity between the poet, actor and audience is structured analogously to unity between God and humans in Śaiva theology.

In this comprehensive view, the concept of intuition emerges as the innate power of consciousness that evolves from a first, noumenal moment through stages of increasingly formed language into self-conscious thoughts and communicable expressions. Language, in Abhinava's Śaiva Tantric view, is not merely the fabric of thought and communication, but subtle language in the highest sphere is the world-creative material itself. Supreme language, *parā vāk* or *pratibhā devī*, is the voice that is God's mind. This large meaning of a world-creative language is never entirely absent whenever Abhinava speaks of knowledge in other contexts. Language is the web of human society and the link between humans and the divine. Ordinary language binds humans to the world and makes them cattle (*paśu*) relative to the Lord; but the supreme language, being the essential identity between consciousness and Consciousness, leads a fettered beast back to the recognition of his true, sovereign nature.

Poetic language evokes meanings deeper and more moving than literal expressions of ordinary language. For Ānandavardhana the literary theorist, suggested meanings are the soul of poetry because they penetrate mere conventions to arouse the sensitive audience's sympathetic feelings. Abhinava devises a psychological theory to show how literary and dramatic stimuli turn emotional states (*bhāva*) into aesthetic sentiments (*rasa*), and how these sublime emotions repose in and are relished by the soul.

In this way, Abhinava views humans as god-like in nature and power. The human mind, even in a cattle-like state of bondage, has an independent and sovereign power of imagination. The human condition is underlaid by a spirited desire to know and to act. At bottom, a self-awareness of one's own agency in knowledge and action is the wonderment (*camatkāra*) that Abhinava ascribes commonly to ordinary cognitive and aesthetic perceptions. *Camatkāra* is the joy of perceiving the self by the self. It is a supreme wonder and delight in the knowledge that 'I' illuminate my thoughts; *camatkāra* is also the pleasure of relishing aesthetic sentiments by the self that savors its emotive creations. Abhinava transforms the deplorable transience of *saṃsāra* into a world renewed at every moment. Images in thought and action succeed one another, and everything that comes into existence, good or evil, is real. The ordinary world of transactions (*vyavahāra*) based on human conventions is real because of being constantly useful to people. So, too, the extraordinarily beguiling world of poetry and drama is a reality proven by the sheer experience of enjoyment.

Bringing together these facets of the concept of intuition while focusing on its development in the aesthetic context, I trace the conceptual sources to the notions of intuition in the first *kāṇḍa* of Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* and Utpaladeva's treatment of cognition in the *Íśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī*, in chapter two, "Bhartṛhari's Notion of Intuition in the *Vākyapadīya*." and chapter three, "Intuition in the Śaiva Theory of Cognition," respectively. Bhartṛhari's theory of language is critically important for the Śaiva theory of cognition, as well as for Ānanda's theory of suggestion in poetics. Specifically, the *VP* postulates that Brahman, the essence of language

(*śabdatattva*), is present in the world in two ways: it is embedded (*saṃniveśita*) in each individual consciousness (*pratyakcaitanya*); and it is revealed as the Veda in the intuitions of the seers. Brahman which is one is divided into many in the form of Speech (*vāc*). Similarly in a human, Speech, called "the reflecting one," (*pratyavamarśinī*) is the subjective form of language which renders the homogeneous consciousness perceptible to itself and others. Intuition is the juncture between consciousness and its form of diversity. As the noumenon that unfolds into three subsequent stages of Speech, intuition qualifies (or approximates) reality which is Brahman on one side and becomes revealed as concrete thought and apprehension in the diverse form of language on the other.

In chapter three, it is shown that the basic notions of consciousness and language found in the *VP* are borrowed by Utpaladeva in developing his Śaiva theory of full consciousness (*saṃvid*). Such a consciousness characterized by illuminating and reflecting aspects is capable of complex thought-formation. A mental image presented in mind as an object-cognition is consciousness's subjective creation by the cognizer (*pramātṛ*), who in being an agent, as the Śaivas emphasize repeatedly, is independent (*svatantra*) and sovereign (*aiśvara*). Cognition, determined by an intuition of what it is from what it is not, is basically verbal in nature. An object-cognition rests on a subjective awareness, and this apperception inherent in awarenesses is the condition of normal mental life in which the world appears as external objects of 'my' consciousness. Apperception (*anuvyavasāya*), which in the Śaiva philosophy denotes a mental function capable of arranging mental events into a coherent and meaningful order, is

used by Abhinava in the *Abhinavabhāratī* to account for the theater (*nāṭya*) as an expanse of imaginative re-creation. The theater is re-creation. It is like an apperception in that the spectator relishes his/her mental states that have been aroused and colored by poetic/dramatic propriety (*aucitya*) into a sublimely pleasurable object of contemplation.

Bhartṛhari's concept of intuition, in a different way, is also a cornerstone of Ānandavardhana's innovations in poetics. It provides the ground for asserting that suggestive meanings are the essence of poetry, above and beyond literal meanings. In chapter four, it is shown that Ānanda's theory of suggestion (*rasadhvani*) reorients the aesthetic attitude toward elements that ought to be counted as causes of beauty. In contrast to his predecessors, Ānanda's new literary criticism states that the essential poetic beauty consists in suggested meanings that bring about an aesthetic sentiment: through poetry a poet communicates and imparts his feelings to the audience. Although the traditions of poetics and dramaturgy have indirectly presaged a notion that the poet's feelings (*bhāva*) control the poem and bring about similar feelings in the readers, Ānanda forcefully redefines the object of true poetry as states of mind (*cittavṛtti*) and poetic communication as a sympathy of hearts.

A vital question, which seems to elicit sage opinions from several quarters in the following centuries, revolves around the nature of the *rasa*. Exciting debates cited by Abhinava in devising his own explanation also illuminate his thought processes, as he refutes while, at the same time, extracting useful ideas from opponents' arguments. In the course of the argument he maintains by emphatic repetitions in the *Locana* and the

Abhinavabhāratī that intuition (*pratibhā*) is the cooperating cause of the audience's perception of a *rasa*; that a *rasa* is perceived, produced and revealed; that an aesthetic experience is an obstructionless consciousness (*avighnā saṃvit*) in its relishing (*rasanā, carvaṇā*) of the object which is a *rasa*; that the theater is a re-creation (*anukīrtana*), which is like an apperception (*anuvyavasāya*), rather than an imitation (*anukaraṇa*); that human thoughts and feelings are influenced by their trace impressions; that the *vibhāvādi* are emotional stimuli (*uparañjaka*) and not emotional causes (*kāraṇa*), and so on. These assertions combined show a rigorously formed structure of aesthetic perception which is described in chapter five, "The Structure of Perception in Aesthetic Experience."

While seemingly an independent and original commentator, Abhinava is faithful to the traditions and the texts on which he comments. Even though Ānandavardhana has said nothing at all about the sensitive audience's intuition and imagination (*pratibhā*), Abhinava thinks that the great poetician implies that a poet's *rasa* is the root of poetry/drama, bearing its fruit in a like sentiment of the audience. How does one devise an epistemological scheme that can successfully treat such a flimsy and ephemeral, tie? So, too, there are many problems in describing perceptions from the perspectives of the poet, actor, character, and spectator who are engaged in the same drama/poetry from different angles. Like Hydra's head, several problems arise in the place of each one that has been freshly lopped off, for we see that theories proffered by Buddhists, Mīmāṃsaka ritualists, Sāṃkhya philosophers, poeticians and dramaturgists are thoughtfully considered and refuted for different reasons by our Śaiva

philosopher.

Abhinava clearly does not want an aesthetic experience to be completely transcendent--beyond the world--while he maintains that it is not anything found in the workaday world. More important, in view of the Śaiva religious philosophy, nothing can be outside of the unity of consciousness which manifests ideas and images in only one way; and in this system to be is to be perceived. In structuring a scheme of aesthetic communication, therefore, Abhinava naturally employs the Śaiva epistemology which fortunately lends itself well in this regard. Its explanation of cognition as an imaginative process already makes it adaptable to the treatment of aesthetic imagination in poetics. In a close analogy to the Śaiva universe--a unity in which human minds reflect God's imaginings--unfolding from the noumenon of God's *pratibhā* into material phenomena, the theater is a re-creation in uniting the spectators' imagination with the poet's designs. The poet's intuitions are resounded by the audience's emotive experiences. The viewers contemplate and relish imaginings which flow with the actor's dramatic portrayal but which are shaped by beginningless trace impressions in their own psychic substrata.

A following point is made in the concluding chapter, "Discussion and Conclusion: the Creative Intuition": our medieval philosophers implicitly believe that innovative ideas arise out of conservative traditions. Such great minds that form a traditional background to Abhinava's thought are radically original; their credence in originality is expressed in the use of the idea of intuition. Yet these philosophers persistently argue for incalculable values of tradition that gives life to fresh visions. The creative process never

means a break with the past; it is a spontaneous presentation formed by unaccountable trace-impressions. Although Abhinava highly regards this world's reality, with its achievements in the arts and scholarship, his concept of intuition falls back ultimately in support of traditional ideals of morality and liberation. Thus, in his view, human intuitions realized outwardly as phenomena in the world inwardly illuminate the nature of self which, Indian philosophers say, ought to be seen and heard.

Chapter 2

Bhartṛhari's notion of intuition in the *Vākyapadīya*

In different philosophical systems intuition (*pratibhā*) occupies a peculiar place among the valid means of knowledge. It is generally considered a perception which arises without the benefit of direct sensory experience and therefore not a reliable source of valid knowledge. Some, however, consider it the highest kind of revelatory knowledge that is the basis of scriptural and testimonial wisdom which cannot be gained from an ordinary, rational, experience. Abhinavagupta's use of the term indicates its presence in all human knowledges and experiences of ordinary cognitive, aesthetic, and religious nature.

That the concept of intuition occupies a central place in Abhinava's philosophy directly results from his interests in several branches of learning. Particularly in aesthetics, the notion of intuition is formulated by using the Śaiva theory of knowledge to furnish a more rigorous explanation for Ānandavardhana's seminal ideas concerning the communication between a poet and his audience. In this communication, a *rasa*, an aesthetic sentiment, is the primary object of communication. In order to fully appreciate Abhinava's ramifications of this term, we will examine the sources of his conception in the Śaiva theory of knowledge and in the language theory of Bhartṛhari, both of which make profound contributions to

Abhinava's insights in the field of poetics and dramaturgy.

In Abhinavagupta's lifetime, the society of Kashmir hung in a balance between its splendid culture and political turmoil. The arts and scholarship flourished amidst the rapidly changing fortunes of rulers and ministers who were faced with factional wars within and the impending Muslim invasion without.[5] For a populace that highly valued the pleasures of life, and a society in which *dharma* was challenged by the behavior of kings and commoners alike,[6] Abhinava views poetry and drama as a means to accomplish the four aims of life. All śāstric texts are assumed to promote these aims, and poetry is inherently valuable in this regard.[7] In the first chapter of the *Abhinavabhāratī* Abhinava argues that the *Nāṭyaśāstra* is a

---

5 For Abhinava's historical background see K.C. Pandey, *Abhinavagupta: An Historical and Philosophical Study*, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies, vol. 1 (2d ed. rev. and enlarged, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1963). For a history of Kashmir see *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī: A Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmīr*, Vol. 1, M.A. Stein, tr. (Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979). Kalhaṇa mentions briefly the Muslim enchroachment (*RT* 7.70), led by Mahmud of Ghazni. See also Stein's introduction, pp. 106-108.

6 If Somānanda's remark in *Śivadṛṣṭi* 1.37-8, and Utpala's comment could be taken as an oblique social comment, we have this passage: "*nivāsini śarīrāṇi gṛhṇāti parameśvaraḥ / yathā nṛpaḥ sārvabhaumaḥ prabhāvāmodabhāvitaḥ // krīḍan karoti pādātadharmāṃs taddharmadharmataḥ / tathā prabhuḥ pramodātmā krīḍaty evaṃ tathā tathā.*" "The Supreme Lord takes on the bodies, which are inhabitants [in the depth of the ocean of hell]. Just as a sovereign king of the realm, overjoyed by his power, sports at making the dharmas of commoners his own dharmas, just so, the Lord, whose essence is joy, plays similarly thus." Utpala's comment says, "He illustrates this very idea by a worldly example." Radheshyam Caturvedi, ed, tr. *The Śivadṛṣṭi of Śrī Somānandanātha with the vṛtti of Śrī Utpaladeva.* (Benares: Varanaseya Sanskrit Sansthan, 1986.), p. 25. Kalhaṇa also reports with disapproval the behavior of kings who broke caste-rules and romped around with washermen and washerwomen. See *RT*, n. 1 above.

7 Gary A. Tubb, "Śāntarasa in Mahābhārata." *Journal of South Asian Literature*, XX.1 (Winter/Spring 1985), pp. 141-68. Reprinted in Arvind Sharma, ed., *Essays on the Mahābhārata*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), pp. 171-203.

śāstra, a technical and scholarly composition containing systematic knowledge, against those who view it as a *veda*, scripture in the sense of traditional knowledge.[8] The *Nāṭyaśāstra*, often calling itself a *veda*, recounts its origin as a fifth *veda*: Brahman, beseeched by Indra to create an entertainment which can be seen and heard, drawing from four vedas their essential characteristics, creates the *Nāṭyaveda* in which all things human are represented, for the instruction of women and śūdras who are not eligible to study the four Vedas.[9] For Abhinava, the theater, like a bitter medicine glazed with molasses, teaches *dharma* to a rude and uncivilized world of enmeshed in pleasure and pain.[10] Poetry similarly instructs in the manner of a wife in contrast to scripture and history which are like a master and a friend respectively.[11] Moreover, an enjoyment of drama and poetry that culminates in the relishing of an aesthetic sentiment is not an ordinary experience such as occurs in a workaday situation. An

---

[8] R.S. Nagar, ed., *Naṭyaśāstra* (*NŚ*) *of Bharatamuni*, with the commentary *Abhinavabhāratī* by Abhinavaguptācāryā, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (New Delhi, Parimal publications, 1988), pp. 2-5.

[9] *NŚ*, 1.11-18, vol. 1, pp. 9-14.

[10] *Abhinavabhāratī* (*Abh*), p. 9-10 "*idam asmākam guḍapracchannakaṭukauṣadha-kalpam cittavikṣepamātraphalam.*" Bharata, *Nāṭyaśāstra.* With the *Abhinavabāratī* commentary of Abhinavagupta. Nagar, ed. (2nd ed., New Delhi, Parimal publications, 1988). For a similar expression see Aśvaghoṣa's *Saundarananda* 17.63. I am indebted for this reference to J. Robert Phillips.

[11] Daniel H. H. Ingalls, Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson, and M. V. Patwardhan, trs., *The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana* (*Dhā*), with the *Locana* (*DhāL*) of Abhinavagupta (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1990), pp. 71, 533. "For everyone takes delight in the sidelong glance of his beloved and so the hearer, who is to be improved, being started by this delight, will be led on to understand the true nature of things in an indirect way, just as a child is led on to take medicine by one's putting sugar on his tongue, and so will end up in a state of disenchantment with worldly things."

aesthetic experience consists in a particular kind of imagination and contemplation that uniquely arise in the special context of the theater. Remarking on the difference between an aesthetic emotion, *rasa*, and an ordinary emotion, Masson writes,

> Why? Because literature is not the real world. Nothing really takes place. The world of the past is transformed into art, and in watching this transformation... we somehow (for it is never explained precisely how this is achieved) touch the very core of our being. One distinction is that *rasa* s and *bhāva* s are magical. That is they exist for the duration of a play. Abhinava explains that they have no parallel in the real world... The opponent asks Abhinava: "But there is nothing in the whole world like this." "Ah", says Abhinava, "at last you have understood" *Rasa* is *alaukika*."[12]

Masson is quite right in saying that, in Abhinavagupta's view, aesthetic perception occurs only in a poetic and theatrical context. Although Abhinavagupta does not give an exposition of the transformation of a direct perception into art, a process in which "...we somehow touch the core of our being," in defining *rasa* as an extraordinary kind of knowledge he consistently and rigorously describes the nature of this experience. The theater is a special continuum that transforms ordinary cognitions into aesthetic perceptions. The theater is a place of the imagination. Its scintillating sights and sounds, the actors' costumes and actions, are not mere objects of cognition but rather of a special intuition and imagination, *pratibhā*. For this reason, as he comments on the *Dhvanyāloka*, Abhinava insists that both the poet and the audience possess *pratibhā*,[13] and

---

[12] J.M. Masson and M.V. Patwardhan, *Aesthetic Rapture* (*AR*), Vol. 1 (Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1970), p. 32.

modifies Ānandavardhana's original verse and comment in saying that, like the audience in viewing a play, the poet in writing a verse is filled with *rasa* and therefore aesthetically removed from his own personal emotions.[14] This modification, which does not escape the notice of the translators, is not incidental but central to the structure of communication and perception in the poetic/dramatic context.

Abhinavagupta's explanation of aesthetic perception relies on

---

13 Ānandavardhana, *Dhvanyāloka* (*Dhā*). With the *Locana* (*DhāL*) Commentary of Abhinavagupta. Pt. Mahadevaśāstrī, ed. Kashi Sanskrit Series (KSS) 135 (Benares: Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series Office, 1940). *DhāL* 1.4 "*pratipattṛpratibhāsahakāritvaṃ hy asmābhir dyotanasya prāṇatvenoktam* (KSS 135, p. 68) and "*ata tadviśeṣo 'pi sahakārī kalpyate, tarhi vaktṛpratipattṛpratibhāprāṇito dhvananavyāpāraḥ kiṃ na sahyate.*" (KSS 135, p. 69)

14 *DhāL* 1.5 "*Śoka iti krauñcasya dvandvaviyogena sacarīhananodbhūtena sāhacaryadhvaṃsanenotthito yaḥ śokaḥ sthāyibhāvo nirapekṣabhāvatvād vipralambhaśṛṅgārocitaratisthāyibhāvād anya eva, sa eva tathābhūtavibhāva-tadutthākrandādyanubhāvacarvaṇayā hṛdayasaṃvādatanmayībhavanakramād ākrandāsvādyamānatāṃ pratipannaḥ karuṇarasarūpatāṃ laukikaśokavyatiriktāṃ svacittadrutisamāsvādyasārāṃ pratipanno rasaparipūrṇakumbhoccalanavac cittavṛttiniḥṣyandasvabhāvavāgvilāpādivac ca samayānapekṣatve 'pi cittavṛttivyañjakatvād iti nayenākṛtakatayaivāveśavaśāt samucitaśabdacchandovṛttādiniyantritaślokarūpatāṃ prāptaḥ... na tu muneḥ śoka iti mantavyam. evaṃ hi sati tadduḥkhena so 'pi duḥkhita iti kṛtvā rasasyātmateti niravakāśaṃ bhavet. na ca duḥkhasantaptasyaiṣā daśeti. evaṃ carvaṇocitaśokasthāyibhāvātmakakaruṇarasam uccalanasvabhāvatvāt sa eva kāvyasyātmā sārabhūtasvabhāvo 'paraśabdavailakṣaṇyakārakaḥ.* (KSS 135, pp. 75-77). See Ingalls' tr. p. 115 and n. 5, p. 118, on the poet's *rasa*; and n. 9, p. 119, "See how subtly Abhinava alters the meaning of his text. We are not to think of the grief as belonging to Vālmīki. The grief is the bird's. It gives birth in Vālmīki not to grief but to a relishing of the bird's grief."; and Ingalls' introduction, p. 19 "The notion of Abhinava that Vālmīki ruminated on the determinants and consequents of the bird's bereavement and so developed his *rasa* in the scriptural way strikes me as an addition quite foreign to the view of Ānanda." D.H.H. Ingalls, et al. trans. *The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana with the Locana of Abhinavagupta*, HOS 49, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990).

philosophical Śaivism's general theory of cognition, specifically as put forward in Utpaladeva's *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā* (*IPK*) In the latter intuitions are innate verbal presentations that mediate between indeterminate (*nirvikalpaka*) and determinate (*savikalpaka*) cognitions, producing a verbal and determinate awareness that follows from an initial awareness of inchoate sensory perceptions. A particular of that generalized intuition is active in aesthetic experiences which arise through the extraordinary and delightful means of poetry, music, costume, singing, dancing, acting, and so on in the theatrical atmosphere.

Abhinava says of the aesthetic intuition, i.e., the imagination,

> *pratipattṝn prati sā pratibhā nānumīyamānā, api tu tadāveśena bhāsamānety arthaḥ. yad uktam asmadupādhyāyabhaṭṭatautena--'nāyakasya kaveḥ śrotuḥ samāno 'nubhavas tataḥ' iti. 'pratibhā' apūrvavastunirmāṇakṣamā prajñā;*[15] *tasyā 'viśeṣo' rasāveśavaiśadyasaundaryaṃ kāvyanirmāṇakṣamatvam.*[16]

On the part of the perceivers, this intuition is not inferred but shines because one is filled with it (*tadāveśena*). This is the meaning. As my teacher Bhaṭṭatauta has said, "Therefore, the experience of the hero, the

[15] Cf. *IPKv* 1.63, KSTS 34, p. 26. "*apūrvārthanirmāṇajñānasāmarthyāc ca vikalpa eva sarvasya sarvajñatvaṃ ca sphuṭam.*" *IPK* 1.64 "*yā caiṣā pratibhā tat-/ tatpadārthakramarūṣitā/ akramānantacidrūpaḥ / pramātā sa maheśvaraḥ.*"

[16] *DhāL* Ānandavardhana, *Dhvanyāloka* (*Dhā*) with the *Locana* (*DhāL*) and *Bālapriyā* (*BP*) commentaries, Kāshi Sanskrit Series (KSS) 135 (Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office), p. 92. This passage will be discussed in detail in a following chapter. My translation here follows from an explication of Professor Revāprasād Dwivedi, an eminent professor of *kāvya* at Benares Hindu University. According to him '*rasāveśa*' means that the poet is filled with *rasa*, just as when a person is very angry there is an '*āveśa*' of wrath. This usage is among those listed by Monier-Williams.

> poet, and the audience, is the same." Intuition (*pratibhā*) is an insight that is capable of fashioning a new object. Its particular is the capacity for creating poetry, which is clarity and beauty because [the poet is] filled with *rasa*.

Of a phrase quoted above, "*asmadupādhyāyabhaṭṭatautena--'nāyakasya kaveḥ śrotuḥ samāno 'nubhavas tataḥ' iti*," Ingalls, struck by an apparent incongruity, says, "An extraordinary statement for Abhinava to quote with approval in view of the careful distinction which he makes elsewhere between the emotions of the hero and the aesthetic relish of the poet and the audience."[17] It will be shown that Abhinava intends to say that by means of poetic imagination which is the cooperating cause in the aesthetic experience, the poet, the hero, and the audience who create and recreate the same drama are united in common imagination.[18]

Abhinava views the theater as a unity, that is, a continuum in which an aesthetic experience occurs. The word 'continuum' is used here in the sense of an expanse of consciousness, akin to the Buddhist word '*cittasaṃtāna*,' i.e., a mental continuum.[19] In theory the unity of the theater comprises an

[17] Ingalls, et al., trs., *Dhā*, n. 5, p. 121.

[18] A hero is one who leads the story and enjoys the fruits of the dramatic action. Ingalls, et al., trs., *DhāL*, p. 413. It will be shown in the following chapters that in the logic of aesthetic perception, a hero (*nāyaka*) consists of the character and the actor in a common identity.

[19] My use of this term is derived from *IPV* 1.5.1, vol. 1, pp. 238-239, "*tatrāpi kva cit ābhāse pramātṛn ekīkaroti nitambinīnṛtta iva prekṣakān. tāvati hi teṣām ābhāse aikyam,*" and *TĀ* 10.85-86, vol. 5, pp. 1950-1951, "*tathā hy ekāgrasakala-/sāmājikajanaḥ khalu/ nṛttaṃ gītaṃ sudhāsārasāgaratvena manyate// tata evocyate malla-/naṭaprekṣopadeśane/ sarvapramātṛtādātmyaṃ/ pūrṇarūpānubhāvakam,*' in which it is described that the spectators are united as one in respect of a dancer. See also Raniero Gnoli, *The Aesthetic Experience According to Abhinavagupta* (*AE*), Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies (CSS), vol. 62

origin in the poet's imagination, conveyed by poetry as enacted by the

3rd Indian ed., (Banares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1985), n. 3, pp. 56-57. In the situation the fact that spectators are combined as one cognizer reinforces the reality of their common perception. In 1.5.1, the argument for a unity of cognizers is that all cognizers are ultimately just consciousness in substance, projected from limited perspectives of embodied subjects; and sometimes the Lord unifies these various limited cognizers, joining them as one in relation to a dancer, i.e., they are in rapt attention with an absence of the perception of the 'self' and 'others,' which perception is the central issue in the problem of *svagataparagatatva* in aesthetics. As Abhinava and Nāyaka both say that poetry and drama remove this problem of the perception of one's mind and other's mind. In *TĀ* 10.85, Abhinava has said earlier (10.83-84) that when 'I' know something that is known by Caitra, or by two, or many people, just as this state of my knowing an object becomes perceptible through Śiva or through others' seeing, just so my knowing what others know becomes a variety of things such as a purposeful action, and so on. For, in the same way, the people in the audience, all focused on the song and dance, take it to be an ocean of nectar-substance. For that reason it is said that the identity of all cognizers with reference to spectating engenders an emotional effect which is full in form. (10.87) If singly the spectators' minds are satisfied by objects being just so (*tāvanmātrārtha*), what quality do they have in common, and how could they become a unity of cognizers? (10.88) But when an object is contained in an arrangement whose property is the state of being known by various people, then this object is other than its formerly dry form. The reasoning here is that in general the state of being known as something exists in a conventional condition (*vyavahāra*): an object which is stable in form upon being perceived generates ideas as to what it is, and the ideas, as meaningful things that promote actions, depend on a community of minds. Thus, an object as known is not 'dry', i.e. it is not confined merely to itself but is known in relation to other things by a concensus of cognizers. Thus, Abhinava also argues for the notion of inference--that inference does not depend on pervasion as a process existing in the objects, fire and smoke, as known by a single cognizer's mental continuum, but rather by a unity of cognizers who although distinct from one another are made one in respect of both an appearance of smoke and an appearance of fire. The epistemological unity of cognizers in respect the object of knowledge underlies the inferential process. Only in this way can we speak of inferential knowledge as new and unperceived before, and not as something known from a previous experience. (*IPV* 2.4.15, vol. 2, pp. 182-185) What I term 'continuum' is thus derived from such assertions about the unity of cognizers reinforcing the validity and reality of experience or knowledge. The well-structured 'continuum' of the theater will be discussed in the following chapters.

actor's imagination, and culminating in that of the audience. The framework of time and space which ordinarily conditions the workaday mind has been removed from the theatrical continuum: all participants are single-pointedly engaged in an uninterrupted awareness of the drama alone. In this expanse of an extraordinary state of consciousness, the poet, the actor, and the audience are one with the others through their unified and vivid imagination.

The idea of a unity has been suggested by Masson in observing that an experience of *rasa* includes identification and distance,

> The spectators do not fall in love with Sītā. This *sthāyibhāva rati* is transformed (*pariṇata* into an extraworldly state (*alaukikāvasthā*), and this is what is called *rasa*. The *sahṛdaya* sympathises (*hṛdayasaṃvāda*) with the original character, and to a large degree he even identifies (*tanmayībhāva*) with the situation depicted. But he does not identify completely; he retains a certain *aesthetic distance*, the name for which is *rasa*.[20]

Masson also notices the similarity between the relation of the audience to the actor and that of *jīva* to *paramātman*,

> At another level, Abhinava compares the actor to the *Paramātman*. He retains his identity (just as the *Ātman* never gives up its self-luminosity) and yet manages to so engross people that they feel they are watching the original character. The spectator is thus like the *Jīva*, liable to illusion.[21]

---

[20] Masson, *Aesthetic Rapture*, Vol. 1 (*AR*) (Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1970), pp. 23-4

[21] Masson, *AR*, Vol. 1, p. 36.

Another scholar, Gnoli, writes on the absorbing nature of an aesthetic experience and its similarity to that of a mystic:

> In every way, whatever the difference between them may be, they spring from the same source. Both are characterized by the state of consciousness self-centered, implying the suppression of any practical desire, and hence the merging of the subject into his object, to the exclusion of everything else.[22]

> The aesthetic and the mystical state of consciousness are not only characterized by a particular bliss or repose. According to Abhinavagupta and his school, they are accompanied by a sense of wonder or surprise. The word expressing this wonder, i.e., *camatkāra* is frequently to be found,....[23]

Such insights concerning relations of identity and distance and an affinity between aesthetic and mystical experiences are well-founded. They attest to an underlying structure of the aesthetic continuum which is implicit without having been directly explained by the author. The continuum of an aesthetic experience is a unity constituted by the reality of a common imagination.

In Abhinava's general theory of knowledge, *pratibhā*, as an intuition or an intuitive aspect of consciousness, exists not only in the poet or the actor. It is inherent in every consciousness which actively creates knowledge by manifesting a discrete and coherent cognitive object out of disparate sense percepts. The functioning of intuition arises with an intrinsic and innate verbalization to which consciousness, through its volitional impulse (*icchā*) and a basic store of trace impressions (*saṃskāra*) and memory (*smṛti*),

22 Gnoli, *AE*, p. XLI.

23 Gnoli, *AE*, p. XLV.

gravitates. In a cognition formation, verbal concepts are imposed on bare percepts, and the awareness of the object graspable in mind in the form of language is a determinate cognition. Worldly communication and transactions (*vyavahāra*) depend on language which is the medium of private thought, public conventions, and social norms.[24] In an aesthetic experience, an extraordinary kind of 'cognition'--knowledge in the broad sense of the word--occurs through a mode of perception peculiar to means and end of poetry and drama.

The unity of an aesthetic continuum is structurally identical to that of the universe: its reality consists of a common sphere of imaginations bound together in re-creating the imaginations of the poet, just as the Śaiva universe consists of individual minds that reflect in their consciousnesses the imaginative plays of Śiva. Yet, the real world bounded by ordinary norms and transactions is different from the theater or a mystic experience. The ordinary world is unified in the ultimate Cognizer who manifests and is manifested by the multitude of individual consciousnesses, a hall of mirrors in which all mirrors are reflected in and by each other.[25] Individuals in

---

24 Abhinavagupta, *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī of Abhinavagupta: Doctrine of Divine Recognition* (*IPV*), vol. 1, Subramania Iyer and K. C. Pandey, eds., (Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986), 1.5.18-19, pp. 282-294.

25 According to Śaiva theology, *sarvasya sarvarūpatvaṃ sarvātmatvaṃ* : everything consists of all things as its form and as its nature. (*ŚD* 6.125, p. 258). Since God is consciousness, all things produced by his consciousness must also be conscious in varying degrees. Thus, even inanimate objects are conscious: this is a cornerstone of the 'light' theory of cognition. There is cognition only because insentient objects are partly conscious and are of the same substance as the knowledge-substance of the cognizer, both being light which can mutually assimilate so that the object becomes represented in the subject. The purpose of the *Śivadṛṣṭi* is, in effect, to establish the nature of Śiva's transcendence and immanence as the Lord who creates the universe by manifesting it through his desire, and

the world act in accordance with the natural laws of Śiva and with human-made conventions, all of which comprise *vyavahāra*, which may be generally described as a rational order or the ordinary norm through which people communicate and interact in an ordered way. The end and means of the theater which govern the modality of an aesthetic experience are distinguished from those in normal activity which seeks a purposeful accomplishment. In order to describe the notion of poetic intuition, therefore, we will show Abhinava's justification of the claim that it is a special kind of intuition.[26]

Abhinava speaks of the aesthetic perception as an act of retelling, *anukīrtana*,[27] in opposition to other views that it is an imitation (*anukaraṇa*)[28] or an intensification (*upacita*).[29] A joy or bliss arising from an aesthetic contemplation reposes in the soul (*ātmaviśrānti*). An aesthetic experience is characterized by a predominantly subjective

---

through his powers of knowledge and action. Concluding the philosophical part of his work, Somānanda says, "*ekatvena tato jñeyā śivatā sarvagocarā.*" (*ŚD*, 1.126, p. 258)

26 Ānandavardhana, *Dhvanyāloka* (*Dhā*) with the *Locana* (*DhāL*) Sanskrit Commentary of Abhinavagupta and the Hindi translations text and commentary by Jagannath Pathak, Vidyābhavan Sanskrit Series (VSS 97) (4th ed., Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidyābhavan, 1987) 1.6, pp. 93-94. "*pratibhā' apūrvavastunirmāṇakṣamā prajñā; tasyā viśeṣo' rasāveśavaiśadyasaundaryaṃ kāvyanirmāṇakṣamatvam.*.

27 *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., p. 35 "*idānīm upāyasaṃvedanālābhāt tad idam anukīrtanam anuvyavasāyaviśeṣo nāṭyāparaparyāyah. nānukāra iti bhramitavyam*"; p. 36 "*tasmād anuvyavasāyātmakaṃ kīrtanaṃ rūṣitavikalpasaṃvedanaṃ nāṭyam. tad vedanavedyatvāt na tv anukaraṇarūpam*"

28 This view is attributed to Śaṅkuka: "*anukaraṇarūpatvād eva ca nāmāntareṇa vyapadiṣṭoraseḥ*" (*Abh*, Nagar ed., p. 272)

29 *Abh* 6, p. 271. This is the view of BhaṭṭaLollaṭa: "*tena sthāyyevavibhāvānubhāvādibhir upacito rasaḥ.*"

awareness. The aesthetic perception is different from an ordinary one because its end and means, within the theatrical continuum, are unworldly, but the process of cognition itself is the same in all experiences. In order to understand Abhinava's notion of active and imaginative construction of ordinary and aesthetic experiences, we will describe the notion of intuition Bhartṛhari's philosophy of language which exerts powerful influences on both the Śaiva theory of knowledge and Ānandavardhana's theory of poetics.

Bhartṛhari's notion of intuition

In the following section it will be shown that Bhartṛhari's essential contributions consist in establishing that an individual consciousness is inherently linguistic, and that a self-conscious knowledge is a reflection of the linguistic consciousness in the form of Speech (*vāc*), i.e., language which comprises personal experiences and expressions of the subject. Language is likened to the senses (*indriya*) through which one perceives and by which one acts upon the world.

Intuition is the juncture between the substance and the form, standing between the linguistically active consciousness and the form of diversity by which a cognition is manifested perceptibly and sequentially. Inasmuch as there is continuity between scriptural and ordinary languages, words (*śabda*) are the basis of all conscious awarenesses, thoughts, learnings and actions; and because the use of language intrinsically involves the elements of sense perceptions, memories, trace impressions, as well as familiarity with conventional norms, an intuition apprehends at once a linguistic proposition and its primary reality in the world. This notion of intuition is extended by

Śaiva philosophers into the realms of psychology and theology in order to forward their theories of cognition and recognition.

Śabda and *vāc*: their continuity in scriptural and ordinary languages

The first verse of the *Vākyapadīya* defines the all-encompassing Brahman as the Word-Essence, *Śabdatattva*.[30] The absolute unity of Brahman, *Śabdatattva*, is inviolable, being filled with different efficiencies

---

[30] Bhartṛhari, *The Vākyapadīya*, (*VP*) With the *Vṛtti* and the *Paddhati* of Vṛṣabhadeva, K. A. Subramania Iyer, ed., Deccan College Monograph Series (DCMS) 32 (Poona, Deccan College, 1966), 1.1., pp. 1-7. Translations and paraphrases of the *VP* are my own, in consultation with existing translations of Iyer and Biardeau. See also Iyer's and Biardeau's translations. K.A Subramania Iyer, tr., *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari with the Vṛtti*, chapter I, English translation, Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series: 26. (Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1965). Madeleine Biardeau, ed. and tr., *Bhartṛhari: Vākyapadīya Brahmakāṇḍa*, avec la vṛtti de Harivṛṣabha, texte reproduit de l'édition de lahore, Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, série in-8, fascicule 24 (Paris: Éditions E de Boccard, 1964).

Mindful that the controversy of the authorship of the *kārikā* and *vṛtti* has not been resolved, I should note here that I take the author of both to be one and the same Bhartṛhari. The reason is the same as the one given by Ingalls on the authorship of the *kārikā* and *vṛtti* of the *Dhvanyāloka*: there are no significant disagreements between the verses and the comments, and the commentor does not mention a different author of the *kārikā* anywhere in the commentary. Furthermore, the comments of the *vṛtti* are always self-assured, without any hesitation or question. The *vṛtti* often takes a verse, which is a concise statement, and elaborates it by citing several opinions and raises questions. A real commentor usually questions his interpretation, often looking for substantiating remarks somewhere else in the *kārikā*, in trying to understand or accurately represent the text he comments on. The *vṛtti* of the *VP* often raises several contradicting opinions that make the *kārikā* seem more inconclusive than before. In order to do this, the *vṛtti*'s author must already have certain knowledge of the *kārikā*; being the author of the latter as well, his comments freely discuss the context of ideas and sources in which the verses arise.

(*śakti*) by which It manifests differentiated phenomena.[31] Its primary efficiency is time which is the basis of all transformations,[32] and out of this unity Brahman becomes manifest in the manifold state through the form of experiencer, the object of experience, and experience. These knots (*granthi*) of the triadic structure of experience, as they supersede one another in the unitary Brahman, become the manifold state of the world.[33]

The unity of Word-Essence of Bhartṛhari is manifested in the world as Speech (*vāc*) in two ways: It is entered into an individual consciousness, and Its manifestation (*vyakti*) flows forth for the sake of knowing oneself and others, and that which flows forth is described as Speech, *vāc*.[34] It is also manifested in the world through the visions of the *ṛṣi*s as the Veda, which is Brahman's *anukāra*, an imitation, which is also described as *sūkṣmā vāk*, or subtle Speech.[35] The parallel ways that *Śabdatattva*, the Word-Essence or the Brahman-consciousness-- universe intertwined with the linguistic principle--becomes *vāc*. Speech or the subjective function of expression and communication in the world, underpin the full scope Bhartṛhari's assertion that language (*śabda*) is the basis of all knowledge and behavior in the world.[36] Scripture, as the Speech which is

---

31 *VP* 1.2, DCMS 32, pp. 14-17.

32 *VP* 1.3, DCMS 32, pp. 18-20.

33 *VP* 1.4 and *vṛtti*, DCMS 32, pp. 21-22.

34 *VP* 1.1 *vṛtti*, DCMS 32, pp. 7-8 "*pratyakcaitanye 'ntasaṃniveśitasya parasaṃbodhanārthā vyaktir abhiṣyandate. evaṃ hy āha--sūkṣmām arthenāpravibhaktatattvām ekāṃ vācam anabhiṣyandamānām/ utānye vidur anyām iva ca enāṃ nānārūpām ātmani sanniviṣṭām//*"

35 *VP* 1.5, DCMS 32, p. 24. "*Vedābhyāsāt varam āntaraṃ śuklam ajaraṃ jyotis tasminnevāpāre tamasi vite vivartate" iti anukāraḥ iti. yāṃ sūkṣmāṃ nityām atīndriyāṃ vācam ṛṣayaḥ sākṣātkṛtadharmāṇo mantradṛśaḥ paśyanti.. svapnavṛttam iva dṛṣṭaśrutānubhūtam ācikhyāsanta ity eṣa purākalpaḥ.*"

an imitation (*anukāra*) of Brahman *Śabdatattva*, is the basis of all learnings which have been developed in explicating and supporting the Vedas, while ordinary language whose principle is instilled in consciousness is used by humans in their cultural and social intercourses to further increase knowledges. The world thus based scriptural and ordinary languages continually evolves, and its expansion is rooted equally on tradition and on human insights through the medium of language by which transmission, communication and innovations are carried out.

It is said in *VP* 1.5 that Brahman's imitation (*anukāra*), the Veda, is rendered many in the form of Speech by the sages for the sake of transmission because that which is one and undivided cannot be transmitted in a divided way (i.e. by means of perceptible language transmitted by hearing rather than a subtle one of revelation which is seen in a vision).[37] In the course of transmission the branches of the Veda form the divisions of regional usages as well as of developments into the limbs and minor limbs that become various arts and sciences.[38] In the latter part of the *VP*, the theme of Speech as the subjective form of consciousness is elaborated. In verses 1.125-127, it is shown that every kind of awareness and knowledge that a human possesses, by which he/she is known to himself/herself and others as a conscious being, is accompanied by Speech. Speech as a

---

36 *VP* 1.123, 125, DCMS 32, pp. 188-190, 192.

37 *VP* 1.5 *vṛtti*, DCMS 32, p. 25, "*tasya vedo maharṣibhiḥ, eko 'py... prāpita*" The *vṛtti* states that the singular thing which is called the Veda existed in the seeing itself. The object, i.e., what was to be seen, was put into the form of Speech itself which had acquired a sequence for the sake of revealing [it] (*abhivyaktinimittāt*), by the great *ṛṣi*s who could not make known an undifferentiated thing in a differentiated way.

38 *VP* 1.5-10, DCMS 32, pp. 22-39.

subjective function verbalizes and apprehends one's own inward feelings, thoughts, and all cognitions of the external world.[39]

This continuity and essential identity between revealed and ordinary languages-- *vāc* as language of the Veda intuited by the *ṛṣis* and as the subjective language of humans--support Bhartṛhari's notion that language is

---

39 *VP* 1.125 states that language as form [of consciousness] is the basis of techniques in all learnings and of the arts. Through its power every object conceived is effected in an external form. Its *vṛtti* states that all learnings are bound in the intellective mind whose form is Speech. In respect of the conception of a pot and so on, every desire to to instruct on the part of the person who initiates and the person who undertakes [an action], is done according to the form of Speech. (DCMS 32, pp. 192-193). *VP* 1.126 states that Speech, as form, is the conscious, inward and outward, perceptions of all creatures. Consciousness in all creatures does not go beyond the measure [of Speech]. The *vṛtti* states that in the world the designation of conscious and unconscious is made because Speech is the form that accompanies consciousness. Speech causes all creatures to desire to act purposefully, and anything incapable of Speech is known as insentient, like a log or a wall. People know their inner feelings through the accompaniment of Speech as the form, and all worldly activities based on it would come to a standstill in its absence. There is no creature possessing an awareness of itself and others which is not accompanied by Speech. Therefore, there is no mental activity without the use of the power of Speech. The very form of Speech-essence is the form of mental activities (DCMS 32, p. 193). *VP* 1.127 states that just as an actor (i.e. subject or doer) in wakefulness sets himself toward an action to be done by means of Speech, just so, in sleep Speech itself becomes the action to be done. The *vṛtti* illuminates the parallel between the manifestation of the *Śabdabrahman* and Speech as it is used by humans in effecting their purposes. The *vṛtti* states that the manifestation of *Śabdabrahman* is in the form of differentiated means and ends. [In humans] in wakeful activities, the knots of differentiation [of egoity] (See *VP* 1.4) into Speech having been transformed into actions of birth and so on, following the form of Speech, strive toward effects by reaching the changes that are fullfillments. But in sleep, Speech itself being the form of external objects has no [external] object; [Speech] effects the action toward changes that come to fullfillments (DCMS 32, p. 195). These verses clearly describe *vāc* as subjective language which is an effect (*kāryaḥ śabdaḥ*) (*VP* 1.130, DCMS 32, p. 200), the reflecting one, *pratyavamarśinī* (*VP vṛtti* 1.124, DCMS 32, p. 192), and the form, *vāgrūpatā* of consciousness (*VP* 1.124, DCMS 32, p. 190) through which all cognitive experiences are determinately known.

an intrinsic component of reality even though it represents a secondary reality (*aupacārikī sattā*).[40] It is intertwined with a primary reality and derives its functionings from the latter because the substance of Brahman-consciousness is not different from that of an individual consciousness. Like light, consciousness illuminates itself and its object in a form which combines and reflects back the object in perception. That form, namely, Speech, is *vāc*.[41] *Śabdabrahman*, evolving and manifesting the world of manifold appearances, is not unlike human consciousness which is accompanied by the form of Speech.[42] Linguistic activities of the human mind culminating in Speech function constantly in sleep and wakefulness, and this functioning is said to be the same in the Great, the cause, which is the essence of Speech.[43] Verse 1.127 of the *VP* states the same thing in a different way: the manifestation of *Śabdabrahman* is in the form of end and means of wakeful moments (*pravibhaktasādhyasādhanarūpa*).[44] During its wakeful functioning, Speech as the form of mental activities is used by the subject in striving to achieve an [external] effect, but in sleep Speech itself becomes the

---

[40] On language as a representation of a secondary reality, see Subramania Iyer, *Bhartṛhari: The Study of the Vākyapadīya in the Light of the Ancient Commentaries* (*Bh*) (Poona: DeccanCollege, 1969), pp. 209-212. See also n. 52 below.

[41] See above, nn. 34, 35 and text.

[42] *VP* 1.126, DCMS 32, p. 193. "*yo 'yaṃ caitanye vāgrūpatānugamas...*"

[43] *VP* 1.118, DCMS 32, p. 181 "*sā ceyaṃ svapnaprabodhavṛttiḥ pravibhaktapuruṣānukārā mahatyapi vāktattve kāraṇe nityaṃ avasthitā...*" The *paddhati* says, "*mahaty api iti. yo 'sau mahā deva ity ucyate.*"

[44] Although it literally means "divided," the translation of '*pravibhakta*' as "wakeful," here follows from the meanings of '*pravibhāge*' and '*avibhāge*' in the *kārikā* as 'differentiation' in the sense of wakefulness and 'non-differentiation' in the sense of sleep respectively. The *paddhati* glosses them, '*jāgradavasthāyām*' and '*svapne.*'

fullfillment which is the effect. The supporting verse states that the Lord of all, comprising all, after dividing himself by himself, and having created separate existents, becomes the experiencer in a dream.[45]

In *Śabdabrahman* combining and dissociating (*bhedasaṃsarga*) efficiencies (*śakti*) create phenomena (*vivarta*) analogously to the verbal efficiencies of ordinary-language in human consciousness which orient determinate perceptions and understanding in normal experiences.[46] Just as the light of Brahman is reflected in the world as the Veda,[47] the light of

---

45 *VP* 1.127, DCMS 32, p. 195.

46 Compare in the *VP* verses 1.1-3 describing Brahman as the one and undivided who seems divided because of the efficiencies (*śakti*), at the same time that these efficiencies are Its power to create, with verses 1.117-120 (DCMS 32, pp. 177-184) describing the *śakti*s as the accomplishers of differentiation. In the latter verses allusions to a similarity with 'cause,' unmistakably analogizes humans' conscious verbal functions with that of *Śabdabrahman*. Verse 1.117: "It is the efficiency of [the perpetually functioning Word (*VP* 1.116, DCMS 32, p. 177)] distributed on the breath and on the intellective mind, evolving on places of utterance that achieves differentiation." Its *vṛtti* states "It [the breath] causes only a tinge of differentiation (*bhedānurāgamātram*) to enter into the highest, undivided self which is the Word." Verse 1.118, *vṛtti*, (DCMS 32, p. 179) states that the subtle verbalization constantly functions in humans as in the "Great," the cause which is the essence of Speech. See n. 43 above. Verse 1.120 (DCMS 32, p. 183) states that, "Knowers of scripture know that this [world] is the evolution of the Word; this world evolves at first out of the Vedas." The *vṛtti* states that some who say that causality is postulated from the evidence of qualities that possess logical consequences from the cause in the effects, attribute the universal manifestation (*vivarta*) to an original matter, the array of efficiencies, the cause of unknowledge; and so, it is taught in scripture that Speech, possessing the contracted powers of enjoyer and enjoyed is the cause. An idea is prominent throughout these verses that *Śabdabrahman* which is filled with (*āviṣṭa*) the efficiencies is one by which the manifested universe (*vivarta*) comes into being, and *Śabdabrahman* takes up manifestation in the ego-form of the knots of experiencer, experienced, and experience (*VP* 1.1-5), and that it is the subjective language, *vāc*, i.e. language as used in the ego-form, that divides up the unity of *Śabdabrahman* (*VP* 1.116-131, pp. 177-203).

47 *VP* 1.5 *vṛtti*, DCMS 32, p. 24. "*vedābhyāsāt varam āntaram śuklam ajaraṃ jyotis tasminnevāpāre tamasi vite vivartate" iti anukāra iti.*"

human consciousness is reflected by means of ordinary Speech which he/she uses in subjective determinations to illumine knowledge in the world and to strive toward effective actions for himself/herself.[48]

The essential unity of all empirical and subjective phenomena is the Word, Brahman *Śabdatattva*, which is also called the great god (*maho devo*), the Bull of the Word (*śabdavṛṣabha*). In *VP* 1.130, it is stated: "They also call the self of the speaker, the Word that abides within, the Great Bull, with which one desires to be joined." The *vṛtti* elaborates in the following way:

> In the world there are two essential [kinds of] language (*dvau śabdātmānau*), the eternal and the effect. Between these, the effect is ordinary language (*vyavahārika*) which causes to comprehend the reflection (*pratibimbopagrāhī*) of a person who consists of Speech (*puruṣasya vāgātmanaḥ*). But the eternal is the source of all worldly usage and transactions (*sarvavyavahārayoni*). Its sequence drawn up, it abides within all [people]. It is the birth, i.e., the substratum, of all transformations and the basis of all actions. Its power to effect objects in pleasure and pain is entirely unobstructed. It is light, seemingly opposed to (*viruddha*) [material objects such as] pots and so on, terminating in the field of consummated experiences; it is the boundless primordial matter of all formed things. Because it appears as all knowledge and because it appears as all differences, its eternally functioning manifestations are imitated in dream and sleep [of individuals]. It is provided with powers to create and destroy, like lightning and forest fire, through the realms of action and cessation. Indeed, knowers of Speech (*vāgyogavid*) who have cut the knots of egoity are joined in an absolute unity with Him, the Lord of all, possessing all powers, the great Bull of the Word.[49]

48 *VP* 1.116, DCMS 32, p. 193 "*arthakriyāsu vāk sarvān samīhayati dehinaḥ/ tadutkrāntau visaṃjño 'yaṃ dṛśyate kāṣṭhakuḍyavat.*" See *VP* 127, nn. 39, 44, 45 above.

49 *VP* 1.130 and *vṛtti,* DCMS 32, pp. 199-200.

This verse, *VP* 1.130, and other passages discussed above, show the distinctions made in the *Vākyapadīya* between *Śabda*, i.e., Brahman the unity which is the linguistic principle intertwined with phenomena, and *vāc*, the effect or reflection of that linguistic principle in the form of the Veda and the subjective language in use. In the latter instance, Speech is the form of consciousness because it reflects back consciousness's light and renders cognitive objects consciously perceived with their determinate, verbal accompaniments. (Language as described by the metaphor of light will be discussed below.)

The distinction between *Śabdabrahman* and *vāc*, as the eternal and the effect, is that between language as an objective and universal principle in the former case, and Speech in the latter case as the subjective function, which accompanies a person and is used by him/her like the senses for apprehending inward and outward perceptions and for interacting with the world. From the fact that *Śabdabrahman* is established in the world as the Veda and as the linguistic principle entered into an individual consciousness, it follows, then, that *vāc* as the Veda is the communicable reflection, i.e., the *anukāra*, of Brahman, and *vāc* as ordinary language in use is analogously the communicable reflection, the *pratyavamarśinī* or *pratibimba*, of human consciousness.

The unitary source (*Śabdabrahman*) of scripture and Speech, both being *vāc*, is postulated because the author of the *VP* wants to establish that language which is intrinsic to consciousness is intertwined with the world and that language of this description is rooted in revealed scripture, because they--ordinary language and scripture--proceed from the same

cause. *Śabdabrahman*, the source of the Veda, is also the source of ordinary language with which a person perceives, thinks and communicates. Thus, Bhartṛhari supports his claim that the surest path to reach Brahman is grammar, (*VP* 1.5) because grammar assists in acquiring the correct knowledge of the Veda which contains the knowledge of Brahman, and because grammar elucidates the truth of relations between the mind and language as between things and language. Indeed, Brahman that is entered into human consciousness is undivided; and differentiation is *avidyā* resulting from the habitual use of language to reify mental categories of time and space, and so on (*VP* 1.1). Since these illusory manifestations begin with the knots of egoity, reaching Brahman is just the cutting of the knots, i.e., getting rid of differences and differentiation which the subjective language (*vāc*) imposes on the mind (*VP* 1.5). Through meditation on language (*śabdapūrvayoga*) and by cutting off the knots, one reaches the original unity, the Great Soul. On the other hand, grammar helps to purify the use of language, and purification leads to the attainment of the homogeneous and undivided source of all modifications in Speech. The source is intuition (*VP* 1.14).

Intuition: *pratibhā*

It is noted Bhartṛhari appears to postulate two sources of unity: the Word which is *Śabdabrahman*, *maho devo*, etc., and *pratibhā* which is the the source of all Speech differentiations. In returning to the origin, one is united with the self which is characterized by being *sattālakaṣaṇa*, which is the Great God, the Bull of the Word (*VP* 1.130-131); or, again, one reaches

the source of all speech modifications, namely, *pratibhā*, the ultimate matter (*parā prakṛti*) which is an approximation or qualification after being (*sattānuguṇya*) (*VP* 1.14, 1.123).

An ontological gap between *Śabda* and *vāc*, the homogeneity and its form of diversity, is filled by intuition which qualifies (or approximates) Being; it is the moment of apprehension between diverse efficiencies of words coalescing into a single object of cognition and the undifferentiated consciousness (*caitanya*) which is the real apprehender of experiences.

Intuition is postulated in this way because in Bhartṛhari's system language and reality, although moving on different planes, are intertwined. The notion of intuition, furthermore, gives scope to differences of subjective apprehensions and expressions which are fully materialized in three stages of Speech. An understanding of a linguistic proposition is intrinsically bound with reality, but as soon as one expresses a perception of reality in language, reality takes up the subject-object structure of the sentence. It is in intuition that consciousness, as the source of unstructured, inchoately verbalized thought, emerges and evolves in the structured form of Speech.

In the narrowest sense of the word, an apprehension of a sentence-meaning (*vākyārtha*) is intuition; it is an instantaneous flash of understanding. In the widest sense, it is the vision of the *ṛṣi*s who saw the Veda, revealed as an undifferentiated unity which the seers saw, heard, and experienced as if in a dream ("*svapnavṛttam iva dṛṣṭaśrutānubhūtam*," *VP* 1.5, see n. 35). It is said that when one arrives at the unfragmanted state of Speech, he comes upon the highest intuition, the origin (*prakṛti*) of

Speech modifications. And from this matter called intuition, which qualifies (or approximates) reality, through the practice of and meditation of the yoga of the Word, he attains the highest origin (*parā prakṛti*) in which all imaginings of transformations have become quiescent.[50] The *vṛtti* of 1.26 describes it as an apprehension of a sentence-meaning.[51] The *vṛtti* of 1.123 gives a description similar to that found in 1.14: intuition is the source of reality, the origin of changes of states, being (*sattā*) which is provided with the powers to accomplish an end. The *vṛtti* of 1.137 speaks of some *ṛṣi*s who evolve in intuition itself and who, in seeing the great soul, characterized by being, become enlightened.

In both senses of the word, intuition by itself is not an object, nor a state of mind, nor words. It is the point between word efficiencies' (*śakti*) functioning and cohering into a single perception and verbal accompaniments that follow, expressing that particular apprehension. In speaking of it as a qualification of being (*sattānuguṇya*) and the origin of Speech-modifications before an idea takes a definite verbal shape, Bhartṛhari indicates that an intuition which results from the functionings of words and their efficiencies contains the possibilities for further verbal ramifications that follow in the three stages of Speech, *paśyantī, madhyamā*, and *vaikharī*. And while the homogeneous consciousness, or being (*sattā*) which is Brahman, is not self-awareness, an intuition, falling ontologically between pure consciousness and its reflected form of Speech, is

---

[50] *VP* 1.14, DCMS 32, p. 48. "*so 'vyatikīrṇāṃ vāgavasthām adhigamya vāgvikārāṇāṃ prakṛtiṃ pratibhām anuparaiti. tasmāc ca sattānuguṇyamātrāt pratibhākhyāc chabdapūrvayogabhāvanābhyāsākṣepāt pratyastamitasarva-vikārollekhamātrāṃ parāṃ prakṛtiṃ pratipadyate*."

[51] *VP* 1.26 *vṛtti*, DCMS 32, p. 67.

undifferentiated in substance; in form, as an apprehension, it is something distinguishable from consciousness itself.

Iyer, without alluding to *pratibhā*, explains how the mind connects with reality through language:

> All these contradictions which result if word meanings are looked upon as having Primary Being disappear when it is understood that they move in the realm of Secondary Being. The basis of the Secondary Being is the fact that we determine things in our mind and use words to express what we have determined. Even what is present before our eyes does not become the object of verbal usage until we have determined its nature in our mind. Our mind enjoys a certain amount of freedom in determining things. The mind separates and analyses what is united in reality.... Therefore, the things denoted by the nouns and the verb have an existence only in the mind. This kind of Being which consists in something figuring in our mind is the basis of the use of all words.[52]

On *pratibhā*, Iyer writes that when one has purified Speech, he attains happiness but not the ultimate reality:

> Not yet.... He must fully realise the *pratibhā* which is derived from the ultimate Reality and which is identical witht the ultimate Being (*sattā*), the source of change and manifestation, endowed with the power of being the means of accomplishment and the thing to be accomplished (*sādhyasādhanaśaktiyuktām*).[53]

On intuition as the sentence meaning (*vākyārtha*), Iyer says:

> ...it is clear that, according to Bhartṛhari, the indivisible sentence is the

[52] Subramania Iyer, *Bh,* p. 210-211.

[53] Subramania Iyer, *Bh,* p. 143.

> unit of comunication and that its meaning is understood in a flash (*pratibhā*). This meaning is also something indivisible, a complex cognition in which the central element is an action or process with its accessories closely associated with it.[54]

On intuition in both aspects of an evolvent of *Śabdabrahman* and the sentence meaning, Hattori writes:

> According to him [Bhartṛhari], there is no essential distinction between the word and the meaning, both being two divisions of the *śabdabrahman*, the ultimate reality which is of the nature of the word. The *śabdabrahman* takes the form of *pratibhā* before it is manifested as the phenomenal words. As the primary evolvent of the *śabdabrahman*, *pratibhā* transcends the temporal sequence of sounds and the diversity of form that characterize the phenomenal words, and it is recognized as the original form of the phenomenal words (*vāgvikārāṇām prakṛtiḥ*). It resides in the mind of the speaker before he utters the sounds, and through the sounds that constitute the phenomenal words the listener is awakened to *pratibhā*.[55]

David Carpenter, who sees *pratibhā* as the conjunction of "revelation and experience," writes:

> *Pratibhā* is in fact the experience in which the two-fold manifestation of the Word-Principle--as language and world, knower and known--meet. This is clear from the fact that this intuition is neither a purely "subjective" event, nor an intuition into a thing-in-itself. It is rather the intrinsic luminosity of the world as a dynamic interrelated whole which is revealed by language.... It seems that it is in this sense, as conveying the dynamic interrelatedness of things, the fundamental 'Zugehörigkeit' of

[54] Subramania Iyer, *Bh*, p. 201.

[55] Masaaki Hattori, "*Apoha* and *pratibhā*" in *Sanskrit and Indian Studies*, Nagatomi et al., eds., (Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1979) pp. 65-6.

self and world, indeed as instigating the enactment of this interrelatedness, that *pratibhā* is a manifestation of Śabdatattva.[56]

While it may be, according to Carpenter, that every sentence-meaning is a revelation writ small, Raghunath Śarma who has a similar explanation puts it in a different way: intuition, which is an object of the intellective mind, is an apprehension in the form of "It is this" (*so 'yam*) which unites an apprehension of the expressor-expressed (i.e., linguistic) relation with that of something in the world (*padārtha*), like a cow, and so on.[57] As for Hattori's view that *pratibhā* is the first evolvent of *Śabdabrahman*, it is not completely evident that Bhartṛhari identifies intuition with an idea existing in the mind before the speaker expresses it in words, which idea is termed *vivakṣā* by the grammarian.[58]

In Bhartṛhari's system, inasmuch as meaning is the principle element in language communication, language as the linguistic principle is inextricable

---

[56] David Carpenter, "Revelation and Experience in Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunst Südasien* 29 (1985): 203.

[57] Raghunath Śarma, *Vākyapadīyam, Part I (Brahma-Kāṇḍam)*. With the *Svopajñavṛtti* of Harivrisabha and the *Ambākartrī* of Raghunātha Śarmā, Sarasvatī Granthamālā 91, (Varanasi: Sampurnananda Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1976), pp. 170-171.

[58] Puṇyarāja's commentary to *VP* 2.407 (BSS 24, p. 254) says, "*vaktur antarullasitā pratibhaivābhisandhirūpā śabdamayī bhavati*," and equates intention (*abhidhā*) with intuition (*pratibhā*): the very intuition of the speaker blooming forth within in the form of an intention becomes composed of words. Bhartṛhari, *Vākyapadīya*, With the commentary by Puṇyarāja, Benares Sanskrit Series (BSS) 24 (Benares: Mssrs. Braj B. Das & Co., 1887). Iyer in his translation of the same verse numbered as *VP* 2.399 adds a note that "The following are the points in the *Ambākartrī* on this verse. The power of a word to convey its meaning is called *abhidhā*. Som consider this *abhidhā* to be different from *pratibhā*, others not." SubramaniaIyer, tr. *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari, Chapter* II (*VP*II) (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1977), p. 171.

from language as expression: *śabda* and *vāc* meet in intuition in which the functions of word-efficiencies culminate in being the determinate perception of the subject, the meaning-apprehender. The intuition of the sages is the linkage between the Reality (*sattā*) and the subjective approximation or qualification (*sattānuguṇya*), i.e., grasping Being from a subject's perspective and in the form of the subject's apprehending apparatus, *vāc*. Like lesser ones, the great Intuition perceived as if in a dream as a unity, is put into the diverse and sequential form, branching through stages of *vāc*; intuitions are the basis of knowledge in the world of *vyavahāra*.

Sense-perceptions and language in cognition

Translations included in this section will show that Bhartṛhari conceives language as integrated with other functions of consciousness, and the subject is one whose sensory contacts and experiences are brought to bear on purely linguistic functions. Linguistic functions are constant and come to self-awareness as associated with sensory percepts which form a subjective background in which word-efficiencies coalesce into an apprehension. Although the Word-principle is fixed and the relation between a word and its meaning eternal,[59] there is scope for differences in subjective apprehensions and selections of words for expression. The speaker takes up an appropriate word with each [corresponding] meaning in regard the denoted meanings whose configurations are obtained by the desire to express, just as one who desires to perceive applies an appropriate sense.[60]

---

[59] *VP* 1.23, DCMS 32, p. 51. "*nityāḥ śabdārthasambandhās tatrāmnātā maharṣibhiḥ/ sūtrāṇām sānutantrāṇām bhāṣyāṇām ca praṇetṛbhiḥ.*" "That the relations of words and meanings are eternal have been traditionally taught by great seers and authors of *sūtra*s (such as Pāṇini and so on) along with the explanatory texts and commentaries."

The *kārikā* and *vṛtti* of *VP* 1.52 liken the use of words to drawing a picture: the figure consisting of parts is conceived as a single idea in the mind and then drawn out sequentially on a piece of cloth or a wall; in the same way heterogeneous words, their diverse parts drawn out and held in a single idea, are uttered by speech organs.[61]

Thus, when the problem of meaning conveyed and apprehended is considered, subjectivity necessarily enters into consideration. In understanding a meaning as well, the sentence is the complete unit of understanding from which word-meanings are derived. The reason is that although words and meanings as linguistic entities are in an eternal relation, word meanings in usage depend on subjective factors of a speaker and a hearer. Primary and secondary meanings arise because a word in use has associations with other words.[62] A sentence also conveys meanings other than its literal meanings,[63] and the author of the *VP* lists factors that are the gray areas, indeterminacy, of word meanings.[64] That the determination

---

60 *VP* 1.13, DCMS 32, p. 44 "*yogyaṃ hi śabdaṃ prayoktā vivakṣāprāpitasaṃnidhāneṣv abhidheyeṣu pratyartham upādatte. tadyathopalipsamānaḥ prativiṣayaṃ yogyam evendriyam upalabdhau praṇidhatte.*"

61 *VP* 1.52, DCMS 32, p. 111. "*yathaikabuddhiviṣayā mūrtir ākriyate paṭe/ mūrtyantarasya titrayam evaṃ śabde 'pi dṛśyate.*"

62 *VP* 2.298-305, Iyer tr., *VP* II, pp. 129-131.

63 *VP*2.310-313, Iyer, tr., *VP* II, pp. 134-135.

64 *VP* 2.314-6., Iyer, tr., *VP* II, pp. 135-137. (2.314) The meanings of words are determined according to the sentence, situation, meaning, propriety, place and time and not according to mere external form, (2.315) Connection, separation, association, opposition, meaning, context, indication, the presence of another word (2.316) Suitability, propriety, place, time, gender and accent etc. these are the causes of our determining the meaning of a word when there is no definiteness in it.

of word-meanings depends on the user is expressed in *VP* 2. 400, and the metaphor of the eye ("Just as, directed, the eye applies itself to seeing, just so a word intended is the expressor of the meaning.") recalls *VP* 1.13[65] and 1.118. Punyarāja equates intentionality with intuition, "It is the speaker's intuition, indeed, blooming forth within in the form of intention and consisting of words."[66]

Bhartṛhari's implicit distinction between *śabda* and *vāc* distantly resonates with Saussure's distinction between language (*langue*) and speaking (*parole*):

> Language is not a function of the speaker; it is a product that is passively assimilated by the individual. It never requires premeditation, and reflection enters in only for the purpose of classification...
>
> Speaking, on the contrary, is an individual act. It is wilful and intellectual....[67]

Similar to this view of language and speaking, Bhartṛhari's philosophy of language implicitly delineates the unity of language principle from the subjective use of language. In the former aspect, *Śabdatattva*, is a unity which comprises ideational and vocal linguistic elements existing in the mind and speech organs. In the latter aspect, Speech is an act of the subjective mind: it is that with which one thinks and which is the expression of one's ideas and thoughts. It is *vāc* which determines for the perceiver the

---

[65] See n. 60 and text, above.

[66] *VP* 2.400, *VP* II, Iyer, ed. (1983), p. 161 "*yathā praṇihitaṃ cakṣur darśanāyopakalpate/ tathābhisaṃhitaḥ śabdo bhavatyarthasya vācakaḥ.*" and *vṛtti*, p. 162 "*...vaktur antarullasitā pratibhaivābhisandhirūpā śabdamayī bhavati.*" See also n. 58 above.

[67] Ferdinand de Saussure, *A Course in General Linguistics*, (Rev., paperback ed., England: William Collins Sons and Co Ltd Glasgow, 1974), p. 14.

identity and character of a cognitive object, and which Bhartṛhari speaks of as the senses that apprehend the world. As soon as a person uses language he imposes a subjective perspective on it; Speech (*vāc*) in use, imposing a differentiated form on the linguistic principle (*Śabdabrahman*) also increases and binds the world through determinate and describable experience.

Intuition flashes forth between the efficiencies (*śakti*) of words in the objective language and their subjective meanings. It is the culmination of word-efficiencies in the eye, i.e., the intentional seeing, of the apprehender, just as it is the source of Speech unfolding into intended expressions. Verse 1.118 describes the role of intuition, mediating between word efficiencies and subjective perceptions:

> The efficiency residing in words alone is the binder (or basis) of this world. With that efficiency as its eyes this intuition itself is perceived in different appearances.
>
> Some [teachers] say that universals (*ākṛti*) are based on the support of subtle words. Indeed, being perceived through the modifications of the support, they resolve through an expressor-expressed relation in a revelation of themselves. According to others, just as the efficiencies in the matter of objects become dissolved into the senses, so, the efficiencies of senses [become dissolved] in the intellective minds, and the efficiencies of the intellective minds in the self of Speech, whose sequence is contracted. And this activity in sleep and wakefulness which imitates each person (*puruṣānukāra*) exists eternally even in the great one, the cause which is the substance of Speech.

> Speech alone sees the meaning. Speech speaks. Speech alone extends the fixed meaning.
> The universe of manifold appearances is bound in Speech.

Having divided the one, it enjoys.[68]

It is apparent that the verse and its *vṛtti* explain how words become understood intuitively as meanings. The efficiency in words binds the whole, i.e., the expressor and its expressed meaning, and the efficiency is the eye through which understanding, perceived in different forms, arises. This is to say that the word efficiency is the means of meaning apprehension which is again differently perceived: within the boundary of word meanings, the arisen intuition is varied in appearance.

Intuition intervenes between the linguistic functions of *śabdatattva* in consciousness and its reflection in the self-conscious form of Speech. Intuition mediates the active consciousness on the one side and the reflection of its activities on the other. As the noumenon between being (*sattā*) and verbal manifestations, intuition qualifies or approximates (*sattānuguṇya*) reality but also holds a possibility for a variable qualification in the subjective character of Speech which manifests or reflects consciousness. The *vṛtti* cites two opinions. One is that the universals of words make themselves known in expressor-expressed relation through the manifesting substratum, i.e., the acoustic words. Another opinion has it that efficiencies in objects become dissolved in Speech by way of the intellective mind (*buddhi*). The latter opinion is cited in order to show connections of language function with sensory perceptions, i.e., that the activity of Speech which functions constantly in sleep and wakefulness is influenced by objects impinging on the senses and the intellective mind

---

68 *VP* 1.118, DCMS 32, pp. 180-181. *"Śabdeṣv evāśritā śaktir viśvasyāsya nibandhanī/ yannetraḥ pratibhātmāyaṃ bhedarūpaḥ pratīyate."*

through their respective efficiencies. This idea is echoed in the *vṛtti* of 1.123 below, where it is explained how determinate cognitions, ideas, are formed as accompanied by words:

> **There is not a notion in the world except that which is accompanied by words.**
> **Every knowledge (cognition), as if penetrated by words, comes to light through words.**
>
> Since a person's innate disposition for language is in a contracted form, so, an indeterminate knowledge even when arising in respect of things that are to be known does not produce an effect. It is as follows: from his contact with grass and clods, etc., although a cognition (*jñāna*) occurs to a person who is moving hurriedly, etc., this state of knowledge is only indefinite (*kācideva*). In this state of knowledge whose seed of the linguistic disposition has come to attention, when the efficiencies of explainable and unexplainable words which cause to understand the meanings are fixed in relation to their respective meanings, the object itself is grasped up, shaped by cognition according to the efficiencies and pierced by words; it is said that the object itself (*vastu*), appearing in a distinct form accompanied by cognition (*jñānānugata*), is known. And it [the object thus cognized] becomes the cause of memory when seeds of sounds appear from other causes (*āvirbhavatsu śrutibījeṣu*). Similarly some teachers [say] that composition of cognitive activities in a person asleep is the same as that during wakeful moments, but only then [in sleep] the seeds of linguistic disposition function minutely (*tadā sūkṣmāṃ vṛttiṃ pratilabhante*). Therefore they say this state is stuporous (*tāmasīm avasthām*). This is the ordinary consciousness (*saṃjñāna*) which constantly undergoes appearance and disappearance (*āvirbhāvatirobhāvau*) in relation to words as its cause and effect.[69]

[69] *VP* 1.123, DCMS 32, pp.188-90.

"na so 'sti pratyayo loke yaḥ śabdānugamād ṛte
anuviddham iva jñānaṃ sarvaṃ śabdena bhāsate

yathāsya saṃhṛtarūpā śabdabhāvanā tathā jñeyeṣv artheṣūtpannāpy avikalpena jñānena kāryaṃ na kriyate. tad yathā tvaritaṃ gacchatas tṛṇaloṣṭādisaṃsparśāt saty api jñāne kācid eva sā jñāvasthā yasyām abhimukhībhūtaśabdabhāvanābījāyām āvirbhūtāsv arthopagrāhiṇām ākhyeyarūpāṇām anākhyeyarūpāṇāṃ ca śabdānāṃ pratyarthaniyatāsu

Verse 1.123, and its *vṛtti*, clearly explains the continuity and differences between indeterminate and determinate cognitions through an accompaniment of words. An indeterminate cognition is purely a sense percept which occurs in passing without becoming consciously verbalized. A sense percept sows seed words which when they come to attention, and when their efficiencies are fully developed, the words which now are capable of expressing meanings are cognized together with the object itself. A determinate cognition, in the form of word-and-thing together can be stored away and can trigger seed words in memory, which seed words have been sown from other sense perceptions. The *vṛtti* describes a normal state of consciousness as consisting of a series of determinate and indeterminate cognitions, in which percepts and words are mutual causes and effects. The mind is constantly active with its sensory and verbal functions interacting to produce determinate cognitions.

In verse 1.124, Bhartṛhari uses the metaphor of light to describe the workings of the linguistic principle. Consciousness infused by the Word is like light, whose form of Speech achieves the reflecting function and completes the illuminating function. The grammarian often likens language to light: language is like light which illumines itself and its objects.[70] It is

---

śaktiṣu śabdānuviddhena śakty anupātinā jñānenākriyamāṇa upagṛhyamāṇo vastvātmā jñānānugato vyaktarūpapratyavabhāso jñāyata ity abhidhīyate. sa ca nimittāntarād āvirbhavatsu śrutibījeṣu smṛtihetur bhavati. tathaikeṣām ācāryāṇām suptasyāpi jāgradvṛttyā sadṛśo jñānavṛtti prabandhaḥ. kevalaṃ tu śabdabhāvanābījāni tadā sūkṣmāṃ vṛttiṃ pratilabhante. tasmāt tāmasīṃ ceti tāṃ avasthām āhuḥ. tad etat saṃjñānaṃ śabdaprakṛtivikārabhāvenāvirbhāvatirobhāvāv ajasraṃ pratyanubhavati."

70 *VP* 1.50, DCMS 32, p.108. "*ātmarūpaṃ yathā jñāne jñeyarūpaṃ ca dṛśyate/ artharūpaṃ tathā śabde svarūpaṃ ca prakāśate.*" "Just as the form of the self and the form of the object of cognition are seen in cognition, just so the form of a meaning and the form

also like light in a firestick (*araṇistha*) giving its flame to other fires.[71] The relation of a word with its meaning is that of an illuminator and illuminated.[72] More important, language is like light because through its reflecting activity an object comes to view. Illumination consists of assimilating disparate objects and combining them into a single object of understanding returning to the perceiver. Indeed, its act of reflecting is the synthesis (*anusaṃdhāna*): the light of language "touches back" (*pratyavamṛśati*) with disparate percepts unified in the determinate cognition of a single entity. Verse 1.124 states:

> **If the eternal Speech as the form of knowledge should vanish, light would not illuminate, for Speech as the form [of knowledge] is the reflecting one.**
>
> Just as luminosity is the nature of fire and consciousness the nature of the inner controller, just so every cognition is also accompanied by just the form which is Speech (*vāgrūpamātrānugatam*). A subtle element of language exists even in a state of unconsciousness [i.e. a faint or a stupor]. Even the first fall of light on external objects, taking up the particular qualities, manifests the mere form of an object itself in an undefinable way as, "It is this (*idaṃ tad*)." At the time of memory as well, when such seeds of perception come to attention as verses, etc., that are to be remembered, the thought,"This is some hymn or verse that I can barely hear," turns about in mind like a bare form of light. And when language

itself shine out in a word."

[71] *VP* 1.43, DCMS 32, p. 103. "*araṇisthaṃ yathā jyotiḥ prakāśāntarakāraṇam/ tadvacchabdo 'pi buddhisthaḥ śrutīnāṃ kāraṇaṃ pṛthak.*" "Just as the light in the firestick is the cause of another light, in the same way a word in the mind is individually the cause of word-sounds."

[72] *VP* 1.23 *vṛtti*, DCMS 32, p. 60. "*indriyaviṣayavad vā prakāśyaprakāśakabhāvena samayopādhir yogyatā śabdārthayoḥ saṃbandhaḥ.*" "Or, like a sense and its object, the relation between a word and its meaning is a fitness as the illuminator and the illuminated, convention being an adventitious superimposition on this fitness."

> is not the form [of cognition] (*vāgrūpatāyām asatyām*), even though light arises, without incorporating another form in itself it does not resolve in the form which achieves an illuminating action. When there appears a bare cognition of objects, i.e., things that are mutually distinct in nature and are mutually unfavorable, a subsequent synthesis is the reflecting back (*yad uttarakālam anusadhānaṃ pratyavamarśa*) which entails the process of combining the efficiencies (*śakti*). This synthesis renders [disparate things] a single, whole object, and it is bound in language as the form. For, Speech (*vāc*), synthesizing and reflecting back in a notion which is qualified by all [of its] particulars and which effects a purposeful action, does not depart from the process of excluding and combining by supposing [that there are] separable elements of efficiencies.[73]

To produce a determinate cognition, light must assimilate the object of illumination and reflect back itself and [its] object. Illumination and reflection complete the full functioning of light. Thus, the entire process consists in light's first falling on disparate things, and its synthesizing of mutually incompatible objects in itself, i.e., into the form of light; synthesis is

---

73 *VP* 1.124, DCMS 32, p. 190-192.

vāgrūpatā ced utkrāmed avabodhasya śāśvatī
na prakāśaḥ prakāśeta sā hi pratyavamarśinī

yathā prakāśakatvam agneḥ svarūpaṃ caitanyaṃ vāntaryāmiṇas tathā jñānam api sarvaṃ vāgrūpamātrānugataṃ. yāpy asañcetitāvasthā tasyām api sūkṣmo vāgdharmānugamo 'bhyāvartate. yo 'pi prathamopanipātī bāhyeṣv artheṣu prakāśaḥ sa nimittānām aparigraheṇa vastusvarūpamātram idaṃ tad ity avyapdeśyayā vṛttyā pratyavabhāsayati. smṛtikāle 'pi tādṛśānām upalabdhibījānām ābhimukhye smartavyeṣu ślokādiṣu prakāśānugamamātram ārūpam iva buddhau viparivartate ko 'py asav anuvākaḥ śloko vā yo 'yaṃ mayā śrutimātreṇa prakānta iti. vāgrūpatāyāṃ cāsatyām utpanno 'pi prakāśaḥ pararūpam anaṅgīkurvan prakāśanakriyāsādhanarūpatāyāṃ na vyavatiṣṭhate. bhinnarūpāṇāṃ cānupakāriṇāmātmāntarānātmanām itaretarasya vastumātrājñāne pratyavabhāsamāne yad uttarakālam anusaṃdhānaṃ pratyavamarśa ekārthakāritvam avibhāgena śaktisaṃsargayogopagrahaḥ tad vāgrūpatāyāṃ baddham. sā hy anusaṃdadhānā pratyavamṛśantī ca sarvaviśeṣaṇaviśiṣṭe 'py arthakriyākāriṇi pratyaye śaktyapoddhārakalpanayā bhedasaṃsargamātrāṃ na vijahāti.

the "reflecting-back" of one idea provided with its particulars. It is a process in which the combination of efficiencies are combined as a whole and are productive of a single cognitive object. The cognitive object expressed by the words "*pararūpa*," "*bhinnarūpāṇām*," and "*ekārtha*" consists of a mixture of words and things, which is to say that the passage is not describing merely a linguistic function or a sensory perception, but a combination of both which comprises a determinate cognition under discussion.[74]

When the *vṛtti* says that Speech, as form, synthesizing and reflecting, does not escape the matter of combining and dissociating through the supposition of separable elements, it is evident that a sentence-meaning (*vākyārtha*), which is understood as a whole in one intuition, is a product of combining and separating because an apprehender in recognizing the whole must also be able to distinguish the parts, i.e., the individual words.

A determinate cognition is real and inherent in indeterminate cognition. Language not a super-addition to perception, but perceptions cause and are caused by verbalization. All distinct knowledge, self-perceptions and mental activities are accompanied by language. Cognition is not passive, but it is a process by which consciousness lays hold of itself [its own illumination]

---

[74] Therefore, I did not translate the passage as does Iyer who takes the combination of *śakti*s to apply only to words. It follows from previous verses as well that a sense-perceptions and verbalizations are mutually impinging, and in a determinate cognition, the form of language and sensory object-cognition coincide as a single verbalized cognition. This is, after all, the essential idea that a meaning-apprehension, an intuition, grasps a linguistic proposition and reality, i.e., that an intuition is a *sattānuguṇya*. This interpretation follows as well from Raghunath Śarma's commentary who takes intuition in the form of "*so 'yam*" as an identification or coincidence of a linguistic proposition (*vācyavācaka*) and things (*padārtha*). See Raghunath Śarma, *Vākyapadīyam, Part I (Brahma-kāṇḍam)*. With the *Svopajñavṛtti* of Harivrisabha and the *Ambākartrī* of Raghunātha Śarmā, Sarasvatī Granthamālā 91, (Varanasi: Sampurnananda Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1976), pp. 170-171.

through the form by which an external object becomes cognized. The metaphor of light is apt: it is the form which 'synthesizes' and 'reflects' back to consciousness an external object as an object of cognition. It illumines itself and its object: light must be perceived at the same time that it causes a perception of what it illumines.[75] For this reason, Bhartṛhari often says that the language-form is an object, *upagrāhya*, and the cause, *upagrāhi*, of perception.[76] Verse 1.125 is translated below:

> **This [Speech] is the conscious perception (*saṃjñā*) of worldly beings within and without.**
>
> **Consciousness (*caitanya*) does not go beyond its [Speech's] measure in all creatures.**
>
> In the world, the designation 'sentient' (*sasaṃjña*) and 'insentient' (*visaṃjña*) exists in virtue of the fact that the form of language conforms to consciousness. Thus, he says,
>
> "Speech causes bodily creatures to desire purposeful actions.
> Whoever is without it is thought to be unconscious, like a log
> or a wall."

[75] The metaphor of light has been used to designate Speech and the soul in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.* Verse 4.3.5. states 'Speech, indeed, is his light,' said he, 'for with speech, indeed, as his light one sits, moves around, does his work, and returns. Therefore, verily, O king, where one does not discern even his own hands, when a voice is raised, then one goes straight towards it." Verse 4.3.6 states, "The soul (*ātman*), indeed, is his light,' said he, 'for with the soul, indeed, as his light one sits, moves around, does his work, and returns.' Verse 4.3.7: 'The person here who among the senses is made of knowledge, who is the light in the heart [is the soul]." Robert Ernest Hume, tr., *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads,* (London: Oxford University Press, 1921) pp. 133-134.

[76] *VP*1.55 *grāhyatvaṃ grāhakatvaṃ ca dve śaktī tejaso yathā/ tathaiva sarvaśabdānām ete pṛthagavasthite*. *VP*1.1 *tat tu bhinnarūpābhimatānām api vikārāṇāṃ prakṛtyanvayitvāc chabdopgrāhyatayā śabdopagrāhitayā ca śabdatattvam ity abhidhīyate*.

As for those who perceive inwardly, their measure of the consciousness of pleasure and pain comes about only insofar as it is accompanied by Speech as the form. As for those who are aware of external things, their worldly transaction based on [Speech] would come to a standstill in its absence. For there exists no creature possessed of consciousness in which the knowledge of itself and others is not accompanied by language. Therefore, there exists no form of mental activity which does not use the efficiencies of Speech. Others say that the form of mental activity is essentially the form of Speech. He says the following:

> "Its form having been acquired through manifestation which takes up differences,
> it is transmitted in all learnings; Speech alone is the ultimate matter.
> Not transgressing unity, Speech being their eyes, Speech being their support,
> divisions in language, such as 'cow' and so on, appear as individual [things].
> They rise above death who attend to Speech, which has six gates, six supports, six awakenings, and six constants."[77]

[77] *VP* 1. 125, (DCMS 32) p. 193-4.

saiṣā saṃsāriṇāṃ saṃjñā bahir antaś ca vartate
tanmātrām avyatikrāntaṃ caitanyaṃ sarvajātiṣu

yo 'yaṃ caitanye vāgrūpatānugamas tena loke sasaṃjño visaṃjña iti vyapadeśaḥ kriyate. evaṃ hy āha

arthakriyāsu vāk sarvān samīhayate dehinaḥ
tadutkrāntau visaṃjño 'yaṃ dṛśyate kāṣṭhakuḍyavat

iti antaḥsaṃjñānām api sukhaduḥkhasaṃvinmātrā yāvad vāgrūpatānuvṛttis tāvad eva bhavati. bahiḥsaṃjñeṣu tannibandhano lokavyavahāras tadabhāvān niyatam utsīdet. na hi sā caitanyenāviṣṭā jātir asti yasyāṃ svaparasaṃbodho yo vācā nānugamyate. tasmāc citikriyārūpam alabdhavākśaktiparigrahaṃ na vidyate. vāktattvarūpam eva citikriyārūpam ity anye

bhedodgrāhavivartena labdhākāraparigrahā
āmnātā sarvavidyāsu vāg eva prakṛtiḥ parā.
ekatvam anatikrāntā vāṅnetrā vāṅnibandhanāḥ
pṛthak pratyavabhāsante vāgvibhāgā gavādayaḥ.
ṣaḍdvārāṃ ṣaḍadhiṣṭhānāṃ ṣaṭprabodhāṃ ṣaḍavyayām
te mṛtyum ativartante ye vai vācam upāsate."

In this verse, Bhartṛhari emphasizes that Speech necessarily accompanies and conforms to consciousness; the presence and absence of Speech as form are the describable characteristics of 'conscious' or 'unconscious.' The use of language divides things in the world and binds them in a self-conscious experience. Thus, the statement, "*ekatvam anatikrāntā vāṅnetrā vāṅnibandhanāḥ pṛthak pratyavabhāsante vāgvibhāgā gavādayaḥ*," recapitulates a previous verse (*VP* 1.118) "*śabdeṣv evāśritā śaktir viśvasyāsya nibandhanī, yannetraḥ prabhātmāyaṃ bhedarūpaḥ pratīyate*."

These seminal ideas in Bhartṛhari are elaborated further by Utpala and Abhinava with modifications according to Śaiva theological doctrines. The idea of intuition, looming between quiescent consciousness and an active thought, is developed into a psychology of cognition: an intuition of what a thing is and what it is not precedes a determinate cognition. For Abhinava, intuition becomes the cooperating cause of an aesthetic perception. Bhartṛhari's profound contributions are seen especially in freeing a subjective aspect of language from its formal linguistic structure and thus preparing the basis for conceiving thought as an act of creation, or an imagination, by the cognizer.

Chapter Three

Intuition in the Śaiva Theory of Cognition

Bhartṛhari's language philosophy takes deep roots in Śaiva philosophy. Although its founder Somānanda rails against the grammarian, his commentator, Utpala who has already written his *Īśvarapratyabhijñā-kārikā* (*IPK*) inserts salient passages from the *VP* in his comment of the *Śivadṛṣṭi* (*ŚD*). Śaiva theory of cognition may be said to be at basis a conflation of ideas in Śaivism, Śāktism or popular (radical) Tantrism, and Bhartṛhari's theory of consciousness. The Tantric aspect becomes more pronounced in Abhinava's comment. It is on the basis of this theory of cognition, its philosophy and psychology, that Abhinava's aesthetic theory can be fully appreciated, and central to both aspects of his thought is the notion of *pratibhā*: a determinate cognition is fundamentally creative and free in its construction. This freedom is the background to the aesthetic imagination leading to the relishing of a particular *rasa*. The statements of the *Abhinavabhāratī*, asserting that there is knowledge of one's self in an aesthetic experience can be meaningful when we examine the foundations of thought and imagination.

Recognition

The principle ideas in Śaiva systematic philosophy of Utpala are related here in brief. Recognition, which is the subject of Utpala's treatise on

systematic Śaiva philosophy, is the liberating knowledge which is the realization, "I am Śiva." Śiva, the Universal Consciousness, is transcendent as pure consciousness and immanent in the world as the substance of all phenomena. Maheśvara, who creates the universe by manifestation, is immanent as consciousness in an individual's consciousness. Śaiva theology posits a chain of causality in which pure transcendence gradually becomes manifested as phenomena: *cit*, *ānanda*, *icchā*, *jñāna*, and *kriyā*.[78] In this scheme a preceding element causes and encompasses all the following. In the first place, God, pure consciousness withdrawn into sheer self-awareness, is the ground of *ānanda*, a vital joy of conscious existence which in turn begets a desire or impulse to create. *Icchā* evolves into *jñāna*, a cognition which is an awareness of something external. From cognition proceeds the act of manifestation into phenomenal objects. This is *kriyā*, the manifestation of inner thought or imagination as external objects. In God an idea directly becomes phenomenal reality.

Maheśvara's immanence is manifest in the fact that an individual consciousness recapitulates the Universal Consciousness of Śiva. To recognize that 'I am Śiva' is no more than the realization of the unity of consciousness, that 'I' am the sole agent and creator of the universe of my consciousness. The universe exists to me as the projections of my consciousness, and this universe is traversed and intersected by all others' consciounesses that are represented in mine. The self which is to be known and recognized as Śiva, is the very self quiescent and transcendent amidst its web of images, just as

78 *ŚD.* 1.2-3, pp. 3-5, "*ātmāiva sarvabhāveṣu sphuran nirvṛtacid vibhuḥ / aniruddhecchāprasaraḥ prasaraddṛkkriyaḥ śivaḥ // sa yadāste cidāhlādādmātrānubhavatallayaḥ / tadicchā tāvatī tavajjñānaṃ tāvat kriyā hi sā//*"

God is at play at the vortex of Creation, delighting in the play of fashioning images called the universe.

Thus, theology finds a corollary in psychology. An individual consciousness is neither completely engaged in perceptible mental activities nor entirely withdrawn from perceptions, in the way that the Sāṅkhyas or Vedāntins would describe real consciousness as Puruṣa and Brahman who are disengaged and withdrawn from mental activities. In Śaivism, consciousness is the cause of joy and desire to know and create. A self-awareness of one's own independent and sovereign agency, inherent in all object-awarenesses, is a marvel and wonder (*camatkṛti*).

Utpala believes that the empirical world is created and arranged by God's will and imagination so that it invariably functions according to principle or natural law, *niyati*.[79] Human consciousness which is independent in respect of the subjective image manifestations participates in a real, external world. Utpala's arguments concerning the nature of cognition are often

---

79 *ŚD* 4.47-52, pp. 98-101. (4.47-8) "*na svarūpavibhāgo 'tra svarūpe tatsvarūpatā / parāparādibhedo 'tra tadvyavahārāya kalpitam // vyavahāro 'py avidyā no tathātveneśvarasthiteḥ / tenaiva vā tathā kḷptas tathā tadanuvartanam.*"(4.51) "*niyamānupraveśāya śive collaṅghanena kim / evaṃ pravartane tasya na nimittasamudgamaḥ.*" Utpala's gloss on the last verse: "*yac ca ... coditaṃ tatadātmakaniyatiśaktikṛtaniyamarūpadharmānupraveśaphalasaṃsāravyavahāra-sampādanāya.* See also *IPV* 2.4., vol. 2, p. 172. "*teṣāṃ nijaṃ nijaṃ prasiddhaṃ tṛṇaśas tilaśo pi anyathābhavanam asahamānaṃ laukikam eva kāraṇam, iti ghaṭe mṛddaṇḍacakrādi... bhagavān bhūribhargo mahādevo niyatyanuvartanollaṅghanaghanatarasvātantryaḥ ity atra pakṣe niyatyanuvartini laukike prasiddhe kāryakāraṇabhāve svātantryam*" and 2.4.11, vol. 2, pp. 179-80, "*yadi paraṃ vyavahāraḥ sādhyate, tarur ayaṃ vṛkṣatvāt, iti nyāyena, vyavahāraś ca jñānābhidhānātmā kārya eva, tatra ca niyatiśaktir aṅgīkṛtā bhavatāpi.*" Somānanda sets forth the idea that Śiva is a unity, the material and instrumental cause of the world; and the world created is not divided in itself for Śiva but divided for us in the conventional world. Utpala follows up this idea that the world created by Śiva is stable through the power of *niyati,* and through this stability such conventional rules of transaction, such as in inference, etc., can be effected.

directed toward certain Kashmirian Buddhists, and prominent in his mind are the debated problems of determinate and indeterminate perceptions.[80] In this respect he resembles Bhartṛhari who answers to Buddhists' critique of knowledge, particularly regarding language and its role in knowing reality.[81] Utpala relies on Bhartṛhari's language theory to provide an intrinsic continuity between determinate and indeterminate cognitions: the subjective language, *vāc*, is consciousness's power of independence and autonomy. Speech which is the reflection of consciousness is the substance of mental activities by which consciousness constructs a synthetic idea of personhood in relation to the world manifested in the substratum of self-awareness. The stability of the external world, in turn, comprises a standard of rationality (*vyavahāra*) which are conventions of concepts that provide a coherence for subjectively produced thoughts.[82]

---

80 On Kashmirian Buddhists, see F. Th. Stcherbatsky, *Buddhist Logic*, vols. 1, 2. (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1962.) ; Jean Naudou, *Les Bouddhistes Kaśmīriens au Moyen Age*, (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France), 1968; Ankul Chandra Banerjee, *Sarvāstivāda Literature*. (Calcutta: The World Press Private Limited), 1979.

81 David Carpenter, "Revelation and Experience in Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*" in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kundes Sud-Asien*, 29 (1985):185-206, p. 201. See also on connections between Bhartṛhari, Buddhism, Vedānta, and Śaivism: David Seyfort Ruegg, *Contributions a l'histoire de la philosophie linguistique Indienne*, Publication de l'institut de civilisation Indienne, série 8, fascicule 7 (Paris: E. de Boccard), 1959, pp. 60-63, and ns. 1, 2, pp. 60-61.

82 Rājānaka Utpaladeva, *Pratyabhijñākārikāvṛtti* (*IPKv*), Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies (KSTS) 34, Pandit Madhusudan Kaul Shastri, ed. (Srinagar: Jammu and Kashmir state), 1921. See verses 6, 7 in which he represents the Buddhist's view in which the problem of a personal identity is linked with determinate and indeterminate cognitions. See also the commentaries of Abhinavagupta on the notion of recognition of the true self in contrast to *ahampratyaya*, I-notion, an empirical self or personal identity, Chapters 1 and 2. Chapter 6 of *Jñānādhikāra* distinguishes between the non-dual self, and the 'I' whose

Utpala wishes to establish that Maheśvara, God or Śiva, is the Self, namely Cognizer who is the unitary substratum of the phenomenal world: His immanence consists in being an all-pervading and all-manifesting consciousness. The individual self is no different from the Lord, and cognition is the subject's activity of manifesting the object in his consciousness. In this process, he rejects the the Sāṃkhya notion that a crystalline *buddhi* reflects the object because either the intellective mind (*buddhi*) will be sentient or there must be another subject who animates it. Here the Śaivas ask, what is the use of positing another subject, the Puruṣa?[83] Utpala also rejects the Buddhists' notion that consciousness in illuminating an object of cognition assumes the form of the latter's reflection (*pratibimba*). Abhinava asks in this case, "Why does it assume the form of the object?" The reply is: "because of the already existing chain of causation."[84] Utpala's related concepts of consciousness and cognition are governed by unity: the animating principle is the same as that which thinks and acts; on the other side the unity of consciousness is not self-enclosed, but its power to create knowledge consists in making connections and relating disparate objects together in one coherent image (*ābhāsa*).

Śaiva philosophers give the cognizer complete reign over his cognition, and the status of an object is that whose existence depends on being

---

referents are the body and the psycho-physical complex. K. C. Pandey, tr., R.C. Dwivedi, ed., *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī of Abhinavagupta,* (*IPV*) vols. 1-3. (Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), 1986.

[83] *IPV* 1.2.8, vol. 2, 104-110 "*jaḍo 'py asau ittham arthasya prakāśo bhaviṣyati iti sāṃkhyamatam āśaṅkate...tataśca sā buddhir eva cinmayī syāt, kiṃ puruṣeṇa*"

[84] Ibid. p. 112, "*evam arthapratibimbakadvāreṇa arthamayī ity api āyāto vijñānavadaḥ. kuta etasyāḥ tadrūpatvam iti, pūrvakāraṇaparamparātaḥ iti uttaram.*"

manifested by the subject.[85] Since the homogeneous light of consciousness cannot illuminate an inert object of a different substance, which formerly unillumined would remain as before, objects must also consist partly of light.[86] The agent is volitionally independent in his choice of cognition, and he is sovereign (*aiśvara*) in the manner of representation because his power for conceptual synthesis is autonomous.[87] Thus, knowledge is an assumption of the object by the manifesting subject. Cumulative knowledge and collective experiences of people are routinized in ordinary usage and transactions, *vyavahāra*. Since our world of rationality is thus rooted in conventions and conventional truths, personal and collective memories which are a basis of everyday behavior and rationality must be valid.

Eschewing external and objective criteria of validity, the Śaivas say truth is known by internal coherence: there is no absolute but only relative standards which depend on unity, be it a unity of an individual cognizer, the unity of a community of a common *vyavahāra*, or the ultimate unity of the grand Cognizer, Śiva. An error, is an incomplete knowledge, *apūrṇakhyāti*:[88] A cognition which now disagrees with a previous

---

85 *IPV* 1.1.1 "*kartari jñātari svātmany ādisiddhe maheśvare / ajaḍātmā niṣedhaṃ vā siddhiṃ vā vidadhīta kaḥ*" ; 1.1.3 "*tathā hi jaḍabhūtānāṃ pratiṣṭhā jīvadāśrayā / jñānaṃ kriyā ca bhūtānāṃ jīvatāṃ jīvanaṃ matam.*"

86 *IPV* 1.5.2 "*prāgivārtho 'prakāśaḥ syāt prakāśātmatayā vinā / na ca prakāśo bhinnaḥ syād ātmārthasya prakāśatā,*"

87 *IPV* 1.5.10 "*svāminaścātmasaṃsthasya bhāvajātasya bhāsanam / asty eva na vinā tasmād icchāmarśaḥ pravartate.*" and 1.6.9-11 "*kin tu naisargiko jñāne bahir ābhāsanātmani / pūrvānubhavarūpas tu sthitaḥ sa smaraṇādiṣu // sa naisargiko evāsti vikalpe svairacāriṇi / yathābhimatasaṃsthānābhāsanād buddhigocare // ata eva yathābhīṣṭa samullekhāvabhāsanāt / jñānakriye sphuṭe eva siddhe sarvasya jīvataḥ //*

88 See Navjivan Rastogi, "Theory of Error According to Abhinavagupta," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 14 (1986): 1-34. See also *IPV* 2.3. The chapter is devoted to explaining

cognition does not prove the former wrong, but insofar as each present cognition is a synthesis relative to every other synthesis, a fixed truth does not exist in this system which recognizes Śiva as a substratum of infinite possibilities of his powers of manifestation.[89]

Saṃvid

Saṃvid is proposed as the full or universal consciousness because it is the unity of the agent combining the five elements, from pure consciousness down to action. It is a concept of consciousness which allows formations of complex mental processes and activities to be unified in, i.e., caused by, consciousness which is the agent. *Saṃvid* is in essence *prakāśavimarśa*,

---

validity of knowledge and error.

[89] A theory of relative truths is set forth in chapter four of the *ŚD* in which Somānanda states essentially that all things in the phenomenal world are real as God's manifestations, in the same way that all notions in mind are real because they are perceived. As for the truth, *satyatvam*, he says, "*tathā yatra sad ity evaṃ pratītis tad asat katham / yat sat tat paramārtho hi paramārthas tataḥ Śivaḥ // sarvabhāveṣu cidvyakteḥ sthitaiva paramārthatā / mithyājñānavikalpyānāṃ sattvaṃ cidvyaktiśaktatā // vidyate tat tad atrāpi śivatvaṃ kena vāryate / iti ced eṣu satyatvaṃ sthitam eva cidudgamāt// tathā śivodayād eva bhedo mithyādikaḥ katham / vyavahārāya satyatvaṃ na ca vā vyavahāragam // tathā ca deśe kvacana rājājñā jāyate yathā / vyavahāro 'stu dīnārair etair vyavahāragaiḥ //* (*ŚD* 4.6-10, pp. 128-9). What is perceived as real is real, and what is real is ultimate because it is Śiva. Ultimateness is established through the fact that all conditions are manifestations of the mind, and thus it is possible to explain the truth of things that are imaginable by false cognitions (*mithyājñāna*). And since all things arise from Śiva, how can there be anything different which is false. Somānanda makes an interesting illustration here that truth, *satyatva*, is not inherent in custom and usage but is for the sake of usage and ordinary transaction, just as it happens sometimes that in a country the king commands that dinars be the ordinary convention in transactions. Utpala comments, "*sphuradrūpatā hi sattā. sphuradrūpatā ca prakāśamānatā. tatas ca jaḍatā tāvan nāsti... sarveṣāṃ ca ghaṭādīnāṃ prakāśarūpatayā viśeṣābhāvād ekaprakāśātmatā; tata evai kaśivatvam*," (*ŚD* p. 128) This point, he says he takes up in detail in the *IPKv.*

light and its reflective aspect--pure illumination and its objectification. These two aspects of consciousness create self-awareness, since in consciousness an object-awareness presupposes a subject-awareness as well.[90] *Vimarśa* is analogous to an indeterminate cognition: it is an immediate awareness accompanied by a subtle verbalization.

Somānanda describes *vimarśa* in the following way: *paśyantī* is an action possessing a prior and posterior states, and *vimarśa* is this prior state, namely, an incipient idea that unfolds in stages into audible verbalization. *Vimarśa* is in the form of desire, like the desire of a pot-maker thinking that he should make a pot, which is to say that it is the mental attitude of an agent toward the object of his action.[91] For Utpala and Abhinava, *vimarśa* is subtly verbalized; [92] immediate and instantaneous, it contains the synthetic thought in which the outcome, i.e., the goal to which a thought is directed, has been determined.[93] The initial presentation of *vimarśa*

---

[90] Diṅnāga also has a similar idea about object-cognition and self-cognition. Cf. Masaaki Hattori, *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, HOS 47 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 1968, p. 28. "*k. 9a.* or [it can be maintained that] the self-cognition or the cognition cognizing itself (*svasaṃvitti*) is here the result [of the act of cognizing]-- Every cognition is produced with a twofold appearance, namely, that of itself [as subject] (*svābhāsa*) and that of the object (*viṣayābhāsa*). The cognizing of itself as [possessing] these two appearances or the self-cognition (*svasaṃvitti*) is the result [of the cognitive act]."

[91] See *ŚD* 2.84-5, p. 77, in which the idea of *vimarśa* is forwarded. 2.44 "*etad draṣṭavyam ity etad vimarśaḥ pūrvato bhavet/* 2.45 *yathā kartuḥ kulālāder ghaṭaḥ kārya itīdṛśaḥ/ vimarśa icchārūpeṇa tadvad atrāpi saṃsthitam.*"

[92] *IPV* 1.5.20, vol. 1, pp. 294-5 "*tau nāmarūpalakṣaṇau śabdārthau ekarūpatayā 'so 'yam' ity evaṃrūpatvena parāmṛśati adhyavasā sā parameśvaraśaktivimarśarūpā ātmavad eva aham ity anavacchinnatvena bhāti, na tu kadācit idantayā vicchinnatvena bhāti.*" And 1.5.19, pp. 292-5.

[93] *IPV* 1.5.19, vol. 1, p. 284 "*sākṣātkārakṣṇe 'py asti vimarśaḥ katham anyathā dhāvanādy utpadyeta pratisandhānavarjitam.*"

encompasses the whole consciousness, and when the presentation comes into bold relief in the conscious mind after it has been differentated as an object *"idam"* from the subject *"aham"* and from every other possible objects, the cognition thus delimited is a determinate cognition called *vikalpa*.

Utpaladeva agrees with his Buddhist opponents that what is perceived as an external object is a mental event, i.e., a determinate knowledge following an indeterminate cognition inheres (*samaveta*) in the perceiver and is inseparable from him.[94] His differs with them as to the nature of representation. Whereas the opponents are represented as saying that the cause of a variety of representation consists of trace impressions (*vāsanā*) which awaken various mental images of objects,[95] Utpala holds that there is a material connection between consciousness and things, through which connection the subject and object are able to be combined in cognition. Combination (*anusaṃdhāna*) is a function of the light of consciousness, the

---

[94] *IPV* 1.4.7, vol. 1, pp. 173-177. *"yā ca paśyāmy aham imaṃ ghaṭo 'yam iti vāvasā/ manyate samavetaṃ sāpy avasātari darśanam."* "The determination which is conceived as "I see this pot," "this is a pot," is also a "seeing" that inheres in the determiner." The idea is that a determinate cognition, in the form of a perception ("This is a pot") or an apperception ("I see a pot"), following closely on an indeterminate perception is inherent in subjectivity. Abhinava glosses key-words, *"avasāyaḥ avasā, samavetam iti apṛthagbhāvam āha. avasātari, svatantre 'ntarmukhe bodhātmani ahantāspade ity arthaḥ. darśanam iti nirvikalpakam anubhavanam."* (p. 176)

[95] (See the chain of reasoning from *IPV* 1.5.1 onward, and especially, *IPV* 1.5.4-5, vol. 1, p. 210.. If (you say) various adventitious manifestations should cause to infer an external world, since homogeneous understanding (*bodha*) cannot be the cause of a variety of manifestations; in that case, varied awakening of trace impressions would not be the cause (of perceptions). What basis is there of a trace impression as well for [causing] a variety of its awakening? The argument is that if the opponents say that the trace impressions are responsible for creating a variety of perceptions in understanding (*bodha*) which is homogeneous, why should a trace impression be responsible for a variety of its awakening?

activity of the agent (*kartṛ*) whose nature is *saṃvid*. The following verses illustrate his notion of consciousness as light which is the agent of cognition:

> 1.5.11 They know *vimarśa* to be the nature of a manifestation; otherwise, light in being colored by an object would be insentient, like crystal and so on.
>
> 1.5.12 Therefore, the self alone is consciousness (*caitanya*), the agency of [ordinary] consciousness (*citi*) which is the conscious activity (*citkriyā*).[96] Denoted by synonyms, [the self], therefore, is different from an insentient.
>
> 1.5.13 [Ordinary] consciousness is the ultimate Spech (*parā vāk*), arisen from itself and consists of reflection. It is the primary independence; it is the sovereignty of the ultimate self.
>
> 1.5.14 [Ultimate Speech] is vibrancy, the great being which has no distinctions of space and time. This is said to be the heart, because it is the substance, of the Supreme Lord.[97]

Utpala's interpretation of Bhartṛhari's concept of Speech as form is clearly shown in the former's commentary of the *ŚD* 2.2 where he cites *VP* 1.124 [116] and *vṛtti*.[98] In *ŚD* 2.2 Somānanda raises an objection to Bhartṛhari's identifying Brahman with *parā vāk*:

---

96 *IPVV* 1.5.112, vol. 2, p. 183 "*citkriyārūpācitikartṛteti.*"

97 *IPV* verses 1.5.11-14, vol. 1, p. 241, 245, 250, 255. 11. "*svabhāvam avabhāsasya vimarśaṃ vidur anyathā/ prakāśo 'rthoparakto 'pi sphaṭikādijaḍopamaḥ*" 12. "*ātmāta eva caitanyaṃ citkriyācitikartṛtā/ tātparyeṇoditas tena jaḍāt sa hi vilakṣaṇaḥ//*" 13. "*citiḥ pratyavamarśātmā parā vāk svarasoditā/ svātantryam etan mukhyaṃ tad aiśvaryaṃ paramātmanaḥ.*" 14. "*sā sphurattā mahāsattā deśakālāviśeṣiṇī/saiṣā sāratayā proktā hṛdayaṃ parameṣṭhinaḥ.*"

98 DCMS 32, pp 190-91. "*vākrūpatā ced utkrāmed avabodhasya śāsvatī/ na prakāśaḥ prakāśeta sā hi pratyavamarśinī.*"

> Thus, they say that the supreme Brahman, the beginningless and thus imperishable which is the alphabet (*akṣara*) in the form of the Word, is *paśyantī*, because it is the highest Speech.[99]

Utpala comments:

> The beginningless and endless supreme Brahman in the form of consciousness is the alphabet, changeless and in the form of the Word. And what is called *paśyantī* is the supreme Speech. Without Speech as form, what is called supreme Brahman even being the light of consciousness would not shine because [supreme Speech] is the reflecting one. Thus, they say that reflection itself is said to be illumination.[100]

Utpala who borrows the idea of Speech as the form of knowledge from Bhartṛhari says in the *vṛtti* of the *IPK* 1.5.11:

> The primary essence of light is reflection. Without it, light, whose configuration is differentiated by its object, would be merely clarity [as of a crystal], and not sentience, because of an absence of aesthetic wonder (*camatkṛti*).[101]

In rejecting the Sāṃkhya model of consciousness as a crystal and the Buddhists' idea of consciousness as a mental continuum, *cittasaṃtāna*, Śaiva philsophers propose their model of full consciousness, *saṃvid*, because they

---

[99] *ŚD* 2.2, p. 34. "*ity āhus te paraṃ brahme yad anādi tathā akṣayam / tad akṣaraṃ śabdarūpaṃ sā paśyantī parā hi vāk.*"

[100] *ŚD* 2.2., *vṛtti*, 34 "*yad anady anantaṃ ca paraṃ brahma cidrūpaṃ tad akṣaraṃ nirvikāraṃ śabdarūpam. saiva ca paśyantī saṃjñā parā vāk. vākrūpatāṃ vinā parabrahmākhyas citprakāśo 'pi na prakāseta sā hi pratyavamarśinī. pratyavamaraśanam eva ca prakāśanam ucyata ity āhus te.*"

[101] *IPK* 1.5.1, *vṛtti*, KSS 34, p. 18 "*prakāśasya mukhya ātmā pratyavamarśas tam vinārthabheditākārasyāsya svacchatāmātraṃ na tv ajāḍyaṃ camatkṛter abhāvāt*"

want to say that a self-awareness underlies every object-awareness: every cognition (*jñāna*) is preceded by a desire (*icchā*) and joy (*ānanda*) in the self-dependent power of manifestation. What distinguishes an insentient from a sentient is the latter's imaginative power and the knowledge of its agency in the exercise of that power. Desire underlies the act of becoming aware of an object through the imagination: a self will toward an objective precedes and conditions the imaged object. Abhinava says that in consciousness itself the world shines with an appropriate form only as "I", in the first realm whose objectification is desire. In God, *parāmarśa* is characterized by desire; [in humans] it is a mental construct.[102] *Parāmarśa* is objectification, i.e., a stage of a determinate cognition governed by a desire [to do something]; this stage may be intermediate and relative to another. Thus, in cognition, an object-objectification (*idaṃparāmarśa*) is made in the light of the subject-objectification (*ahaṃparāmarśa*), producing the awareness that "I know this object," or "I illuminate this object":

> An insentient such as a crystal, etc., cannot be aware of itself as it is and as possessing a pot, and so on. [So, there must be] precisely objectification. In this way, objectification (*parāmarśana*) is the life of insentience: it is self-dependence in respect of internal and external causal activities, innate to itself. It is an unexpectancy on the part of a manifestation in regard to anything else, which unexpectancy is characterized by a repose in itself. When a presentation (*vimarśa*) arises that, "So, I, being light, illuminate,"[103] *saṃvid* is taken [by the cognizer] to be complete

[102] *IPVV,* vol. 2, p. 173. "*cidātmani viśvaṃ prathamecchāparāmarśabhūmau aham ity eva ucitena rūpeṇa bhāti*" "*nanu bhagavati parāmarśa icchālakṣaṇa iti kim etat. parāmarśo hi vikalpaḥ.*"

[103] "*aham evaṃ prakaśātmā prakāśe*" The *IPVV* 1.5.11, p. 175 has "*so'pi aham evaṃ prakāśātmā prakāśe.*" Bhāsakara's gloss: "*prakāśakartā 'smi.*" There are two

> consisting of the cognizer, the cognized and cognition, and it wants nothing beside. Because, although a crystal grasps a reflection as 'what it is,' it expects for completion another cognizer; and so, lacking *vimarśa*, it is insentient. By all means, in reality because there is a repose of an objectification of the 'I' through ['my'] self-same identity with the nature of the cognizer who consists of *vimarśa*, there is sentience at both times [during the desire to cognize and during cognition]. It has been said that,
> "A discrete *vimarśa* is complete as a 'this'.
> The repose in one's own nature is the *vimarśa*, 'I am that.'"[104]

As the passage above shows, the Śaiva concept of cognition (in the initial stage of *vimarśa*) contains a structure in which self-awareness is inherent in object-awareness, inasmuch as an object-awareness is preceded by a volition (*icchā*) and arises on the substratum of self-awareness. The discovery of self-awareness is perhaps much more important to the Śaiva philosophers than that of an object-awareness. Granted, a knower knows the object in cognition, but that the knower knows himself as the creator, i.e, the

presentations--of the 'this' and the 'I'--, and between the two the I-presentation is identifiable with the light that is the cognizer, whereas the this-presentation cannot be so identified. The sense of identification is recapitulated in the supporting verse mentioning the "*vimarśa*, 'I am that.' The Śaiva schema seeks to explain the intuitive self-consciousness that accompanies all thoughts which appear as "my thought," and to support the argument that thoughts are imaginatively constructed and that the subject is aware of his/her role as the creator. So, there are *parāmarśa*s, objectifications, of subjectivity and objectivity.

104 *IPV* 1.5.11, vol. 1, p. 242. "*atha tathābhūtam api ātmānam taṃ ca ghaṭādikaṃ sphaṭikādiḥ na parāmraṣṭuṃ samartha iti jaḍaḥ. tathā parāmarśanam eva ajāḍyjīvitam antarbahiṣkaraṇasvātantryarūpaṃ svābhāvikam avabhāsasya svātmaviśrantikaṣaṇam ananyamukhaprekṣitvaṃ nāma. 'aham evaṃ prakāśātmā prakaśe' iti hi vimarśodaye svasaṃvid eva pramātṛprameyapramāṇādi kṛtārtham abhimanyate no tu atiriktam kāṅkaṣati. sphaṭikādi hi gṛhitapratibimbam api tathābhāvena siddhau pramātrantaram apekṣate iti nirvimarśatvāt jaḍam. sarvatra vastuto vimarśātmakapramātṛsvabhāvatād-ātmyāhaṃparāmarśa viśrānteḥ ajaḍatvam eva pūrvāparakoṭyoḥ. yad uktam "idam" ity asya vicchinnavimarśasya kṛtārthatā/ yā svasvarūpe viśrāntir vimarśaḥ so 'ham ity ayam.*"

manifestor, of the object is a great joy called *camatkāra*. Utpala says in the commentary of *ŚD* 1.7: "*Camatkāra* is rejoicing in the form of being aware of one's own nature as such, its expansion is the blossoming forth as the self of the world [i.e., one's own immanence in it]."[105] In aesthetics Abhinava calls it the bliss of relishing a *rasa*, and it will be shown that in an inwardly directed aesthetic experience, the enjoyer, being aware that he creates images, relishes them as objects of contemplation.

IPV 1.5.12, directly recalling the *vṛtti* of *VP* 1.126, states that there is not a creature whose knowledge of itself and others is not accompanied by Speech, and that the essence of *vāc* is the the form of mental acitivities.[106] Ordinary consciousness is created. The agency of this creation is *vimarśa*, which is said to be *parā vāk*, the reflecting one. *IPV* 1.5.13 states that the conscious mind of which we are ordinarily aware is effected by a mental activity that is *vimarśa*, namely, the reflective aspect of *saṃvid* (or *caitanya* in the *Śivasūtra*[107]): the conscious mind is of the nature of reflection (*citiḥ pratyavamarśātmā*). What we perceive self-consciously is consciousness reflected on itself, through the form of the ultimate Speech, arisen from its own essence (*rasa*). Precisely because reflection, which is ultimate Speech, is *vimarśa*, the agent is free in his power of cognition: a knower knows a thought-object through a verbal designation that occurs

---

105 *ŚD*, p. 7. "*āmodaḥ camatkāraḥ tathāsvarūpaparāmarśarūpaḥ, tasya jṛmbhā viśvātmatayā vikasanam.*"

106 *VP* 1.124, *vṛtti*, "*na hi sā caitanyenānāviṣṭā jātir asti yasyāṃ svaparasaṃbodho yo vācā nānugamyate. tasmāc citikriyārūpam alabdhavākśaktiparigrahaṃ na vidyate. vāktattvarūpam eva citikriyārūpam ity anye.*"

107 *IPV* 1.4.12, vol. 2, p. 245. "*caitanyam iti... kathitaḥ bhagavatā śivasūtreṣu 'caitanyam ātmā'* 1.1."

spontaneously. The Śaivas say that, in an indeterminate awareness, an immediate presentation is subject to an intuitive apprehension as to what it is and what it is not; and through such an intuition, an inchoate idea is put into a concrete verbal form, becoming cognizable as something. This determining is free inasmuch as intuitions arise in unknown ways out of the "essence," i.e., the store of trace-impressions in the psyche. *Vimarśa*, the immediate presentation or the original mental activity that "blooms" into a determinate cognition, is a reflection of consciousness enformed by subtle Speech. The first stage of Speech (the intuitive), still indeterminate, emerges out of pure consciousness, and from this essence a verbal designation that arises develops into a determinate cognition.

At the ultimate level, Abhinava calls Speech (*vāc*) the agency of Śiva; Speech is an immediate presentation (*vimarśana*) in character and consists of a volitional objectification (*parāmarśa*).

> Speech (*vāc*) is the agency which consists of objectification (*parāmarśa*) and characterised by immediate presentation (*vimarśana*). It is proper to Vedic and magical texts (*māntrī*) because it is the place of production, duration and dissolution of mantras and because it causes the expansion, increase, and so on, of mantras. In the form of verbalization, it is united with the Lord whose body is the great mantra; but it is not in the form of particulars of the motor-senses (*karmendriya*) falling under the category of a fetter,[108] or of words that are an effect.[109] just this is the agency of the great soul.[110]

[108] i.e., *vāc* as ordinary language is the bondage to *saṃsāra*.

[109] See *VP* 1.122, DCMS 32, p. 200. "*iha dvau śabdātmānau nityaḥ kāryaś ca.*"

[110] *IPVV*, Vol. 2, p. 187. "*parāmarśamayī vimarśalakṣaṇaiva yā kartṛtā, saiva mantrāṇām utpattisthitilayasthānatvena samāpyāyanopabṛṃhaṇādikāritvena ca māntrī mahāmantratanoś ca bhagavataḥ sambandhinī śabdanarūpā, na tu pāśavargamadhyapatitā karmendriyaviśeṣarūpā tatkāryaśabdarūpā vā vāk. paramātmanaś ca eṣaiva kartṛtā*

This agency, the capacity for self-awareness and object-awareness in image-presentations through illuminative and reflective aspects of *saṃvid*, is associated specifically with *camatkāra*, which Abhinava calls the joy and wonder of the aesthetic experience. Utpala's uses *camatkāra* in a general sense. He forwards the basic ideas that in cognition self-awareness and object-awareness must occur together, and a cognition is not due to the instigation of the object but, rather, to the desire and the illumination of the subject as the cause . The joy of (*ānanda*) and desire for (*icchā*) creation are properties of sentience.

Although the philosophical and sectarian (*āgama*) Śaivas believe that finally the *nirvikalpakajñāna* which the seeker (*mumukṣu*) attains through practice and meditation is liberating because it is pure and unstructured consciousness (*asaṃkucita*), language which constructs determinate thoughts is fundamentally inherent in all states of consciousness. Speech, *parā devī*, which in Bhartṛhari's description is the binding one, *nibandhanī*, in sectarian Śaivism is the noose (*pāśa*) that provides the continuity between Bhairava, the master (*pati*) and the unliberated person, the cattle (*paśu*).[111] The world is an emanation in the essential form of

---

aiśvaryam."

[111] See *Śivasūtra* 1.2-4, pp. 16-28, especially p. 28, " *tadadhiṣṭhānād eva hi antarabhedānusaṃdhivandhyatvāt kṣaṇam api alabdhaviśrāntīni bahir mukhāny eva jñānāni, iti yuktaiva eṣāṃ bandhakarmoktiḥ.* " "Precisely because they are based on that (Mātṛkā [i.e. phonemes in ordinary language]) is the basis(of all limited knowledge), and because they lack an inner synthesis into a unity, these knowledges being turned outward do not find rest even moment; so it is right to say that they are as the cause of bondage." (my translation) Jaideva Singh, tr. *Śiva Sūtras: The Yoga of Supreme Identity* (*SS*). With the text of the *Sūtras* and the Commentary *Vimarśinī* of Kṣemarāja . Repr. Delhi: Motilal

mantra s issuing from the heart (*hṛdaya*). Abhinava writes:

> It has been stated, "The great Goddess, the great Being, is said to be the life of the universe." **Substance** is the significant (*atuccha*) form which is the power of an immediate presentation (*vimarśaśakti*).[112] [Substance is] the form of illumination of the subject and object also possesses just this which implies its [light's] difference from non-light. Thus it has also be described in the *Sāraśāstra* :
>
> "The highest garland [of letters] is the power which is the substance of this world."
>
> So, the recognition of the power is shown as, "This [Goddess] (*saiṣā*)." The heart is said to be the foundation, and in the said theory it is the consciousness of insentient beings. It is also the illuminator. It also has the power of presentation (*vimarśa*). For, in various texts it is said that the very heart of Him who is reposed in the ultimate place of the universe is in the form of presentation and consists of the highest mantra. For mantra alone is the heart of all things; mantra is in the form of presentation, and presentation consists in the power of the supreme Speech. Therefore this has been said:
>
> "Without them [i.e., phonemes] there would be no word, no meaning, nor even a movement of consciousness"...
>
> The revered Bhartṛhari also says as well:
>
> "There is no notion in the world except what is accompanied by words.

Banarsidass, 1982 (1st ed., 1979). See also *Spandakārikā* 3.13-16, pp. 152-166, especially 3.13, p. 152. " *śabdarāśisamutthasya śaktivargasya bhogyatām/ kalāviluptavibhavo gataḥ san sa paśuḥ smṛtaḥ.* " "He is known as cattle who in being robbed of his power of *kalā* becomes the object of enjoyment of the group of powers rising up from the multitude of words." (my translation) Jaideva Singh, tr., *Spanda-kārikās: The Divine Creative Pulsation* (*SK*). With the *Spandanirṇaya* commentary of Kṣemarāja. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980.

[112] I translate ' *vimarśa* ' as 'presentation,' 'reflective presentation,' or 'representation,' depending on the context. The word contains, I believe, notions of light's reflection and an immediate presentation. Alexis Sanderson generally takes it to mean 'representation,' and I agree with him to the extent that it represents in the form of Speech consciousness's illumination (*parakāśa*). At the same time, however, a *vimarśa* is immediate and not distinctly verbal at first. The immediate presentation in the first stage is ramified fully into a verbalization (*abhilāpa*) which is a component of a determinate cognition.

All knowledge seemingly pierced by words is understood." (*VP* 1.123)
"Should eternal Speech, the form of knowledge, should vanish, light would not light. For [Speech] is the reflecting one." (*VP* 1.124)
"This [Speech] becomes the consciousness within and without of all worldly beings. Without it he is seen to be unconscious like a log or a wall." [113](*VP* 1.126)[114]

In this passage, Abhinava cites three important verses from the *VP*: 1.123, 124, and 126. These citations show not merely that he and his grand-teacher Utpala conceptually depend on Bhartṛhari, but also that they use these verses to undergird theological and psychological tenets of Śaiva sectarian beliefs. From Bhartṛhari's language theory, the feminine Speech, *vāc*, readily takes up the garb of the Goddess, *devī*. Speech as an indispensable accompaniment of consciousness becomes the power (*śakti*) inseparable from Maheśvara. The fabric of communication and binder of the world (*viśvanibandhanī*), indeed, becomes the substance of ontological realms and the binder or fetter of humans to *saṃsāra*.

In the context of Śaivism, this passage expresses the belief that the consciousness possesses movements (*spandana*) that become manifested perceptibly in Speech. Consciousness is the Lord and the self of each individual, unchanging and unreconstructed behind all phenomena, and consciousness is reflected by Speech. Levels or modalities of consciousness in different contexts of experience are explained by the theory that language is the basic substance that expresses and conveys ideas in the mind. Abhinava also speaks of *vāc* and aesthetic experience with reference to

---

113 *IPV* 1.5.13, vol. 1, pp. 250-251.

114 In this quotation, Abhinava combines the first half of the *kārikā* of VP 1.126 with the last half of the supporting verse.

Bhartṛhari: "what has been accomplished by those beginning with the revered Bhartṛhari is to be observed here, namely, that scripture (and word sounds, *śruti*) is the appearance of the Word's manifestation, as in the passage, "All the worlds are Speech alone." Since Speech is the source of all things, it is well known as the plot, i.e., the body of drama."[115] Thus, it is not an overstatement to say that Abhinava's general theory of cognition applies equally to all modes of perception--ordinary, aesthetic, and ultimate. The root of this theory lies in Bhartṛhari's fundamental notion that language is the form of diversity of a homogeneous and active consciousness. In Śaiva theology Speech (*vāc*) is the binder of absolute and ordinary worlds, and the link between them, because it shares the essence and nature of both. Speech is bondage and liberation, from the ordinary to the absolute reality, because it is the form of mental activity (*citikriyā*). *Vāc* is the power of reflective presentations (*vimarśa*) giving diversity of thoughts and mental images to the homogeneous consciousness.[116]

Another influence of Bhartṛhari can be seen in the concept of synthesis: the light of consciousness in reflecting back synthesizes disparate elements into a single object. *Anusaṃdhāna*, synthesis, generally applies to the combination that results in single determinate cognition, in contrast to an

---

[115] *Abh* 14. 2-3, Nagar ed., vol. 2, p. 169. " ***tad āha vāg ghi sarvasyeti. vag eva viśvā bhuvanānīti śruteḥ śabdavivartādirūpatvaṃ ca prasādhitaṃ tatra bhavadbhir bhartṛhariprabhṛtir iti tad ihānusaraṇīyaṃ. sarvākaratve ca vācaḥ itivṛttaṃ tu nāṭyasya śarīraṃ parikīrtitam iti*** "

[116] *IPV* 1.5.13-14, vol. 2, pp. 252-266. See especially, " ***nīlam idaṃ caitro 'ham ityādipratyavamarśāntarabhittibhūtatvāt, pūrṇatvāt parā, vakti viśvam abhilapati pratyavamarśena iti ca vāk, ata eva sā svarasena cidrūpatayā svātmaviśrāntivapuṣā uditā sadānastamitā nityā aham ityeva*** " pp. 254-5.

anuvyavasāya, an apperception that combines several notions into one manifestation (*ābhāsa*). In theory, a synthesis is present even in the immediate presentation of *vimarśa*, because the latter contains in it the precognitive desire to arrive at an object or objective which provides the impetus for conceiving a series of continuous action as a unified whole. Abhinava explains it in the following way:

> Or, let an immediate perception be momentary. Even in that case, there is also presentation (*vimarśa*) This is inevitable (*avaśyam*). So, he says, "**Otherwise, how**." If it were not so, then, by means of a single intention (*ekābhisaṃdhāna*) a person who runs quickly, who reads syllable in haste, and who intones a book of mantras, would not arrive, pronounce and intone the object desired.
>
> For it is as follows: there is a knowledge regarding that place, the desire to advance, the advancing, the knowledge of having advanced, the synthesis (*anusaṃdhi*) with another benefit, the synthesis (*anusaṃdhāna*) with the desire to leave another place. Even in this instance, how could one reach the desired place without a reflection (*pratyavamarśa*) in the form of joining and disjoining, which is the desire to advance, and so on. So it must be thought for speaking or describing, etc., quickly. In these cases in particular one undertakes to advance vocal actions on places of utterance (*sthānakaraṇākramaṇādi-yoga*). And here for the very reason that the formation of a concrete mental construct which will come about later is not perceived, there is haste. So, there must be a subtle reflection consisting of a concealed (or rolled up) power of words. For a concrete mental construct is the power of words being manifested by amplification (*prasāraṇa*). Just as a white pot is an amplification of a 'this', ['this'] also has the form of a wide-bottomed belly in which a quality provided with the genus 'whiteness' inheres, and so on, because of the passage '*dhāvu gatiśuddhau*' ('The root *dhāv*' in the sense of 'gait' and 'pure'), is taken in the sense of going quickly which is running, from the force of its own efficiency.[117]

117 *IPVV* vol. 1, 1.15.19, p. 291-3. "*bhavatu vā kṣaṇamātrasvabhāvaḥ sākṣātkāra, tatrāpi asti vimarśaḥ. avaśyaṃ caitat. 'katham anyathā' iti. yadi sa na syāt tat ekābhisaṃdhānena javāt gacchan, tvaritaṃ ca varṇān paṭhan, drutaṃ ca mantrapustakaṃ vācayan, na*

We recall a similar description from *VP* 1.123 and 124. In 1.123, Bhartṛhari describes an indeterminate cognition from going in haste and perceiving in passing grass, clods, and so on, which indeterminate cognition becomes determined a. In1.124, he says:

> And when language is not the form [of cognition] (*vāgrūpatāyām asatyām*), even though light arises, without incorporating another form in itself it does not resolve in the form which achieves an illuminating action. When there appears a bare cognition of objects, i.e., things that are mutually distinct in nature and are mutually unfavorable, a subsequent synthesis is the reflecting back (*yad uttarakālam anusadhānaṃ pratyavamarśa*) which entails the process of combining the efficiencies (*śakti*). This synthesis renders [disparate things] a single, whole object, and it is bound in language as the form. For, Speech (*vāc*), synthesizing and reflecting back in a notion which is qualified by all [of its] particulars and which effects a purposeful action, does not depart from the process of excluding and combining by supposing [that there are] separable elements of efficiencies.[118]

---

abhimatam eva gacchet, uccārayet, vācayet vā. tathā hi tasmin deśe jñānam ācikramiṣa ākramaṇam ākrāntatājñānam prayojanāntarānusaṃdhānam titykṣadeśāntarānusaṃdhiḥ tatrāpi ācikramiṣā ityādinā yojanaviyojanarūpeṇa pratyavamarśena vinā abhimata-deśāvāptiḥ katham bhavet . evaṃ tvaritodgrahaṇavācanādau mantavyam. tatra viśeṣataḥ sthānakaraṇākramaṇādiyogaḥ. atra ca yataḥ paścād bhāvisthūlavikalpakalpanā na saṃvedyate, tata eva tvaritattvam iti sūkṣmeṇa pratyavamarśena saṃvartitaśabda-bhāvanāmayena bhāvyam eva. saṃvartitā hi śabdabhāvanā prasāraṇena vivartyamānā sthūlo vikalpaḥ, yathā idam ity asya prasāraṇā gataḥ śukla ity ādiḥ, tasyāpi pṛthubudhnodarākāraḥ śuklatvajātiyuktaguṇa- samavāyī ityādiḥ"

118 *VP* 1.124, DCMS 32 , p. 192 *vāgrūpatāyāṃ cāsatyām utpanno 'pi prakāśaḥ pararūpam anaṅgīkurvan prakāśanakriyāśādhanarūpatāyāṃ na vyatiṣṭhate. bhinnarūpāṇāṃ cānupakāriṇām āntarānātmanām itaretarasya vastumātrājñāne pratyavabhāsamāne yad uttarakālam anusaṃdhānaṃ pratyavamarśa ekārthakāritvamavibhāgena śaktisaṃsargayogopagrahaḥ tad vāgrūpatāyāṃ baddham. sā hy anusaṃdadhānā pratyavamṛśantī ca sarvaviśeṣaṇaviśiṣṭe 'py arthakriyākāriṇi pratyaye*

The ideas of synthesis in these two passages are very similar. They differ only in that Abhinavagupta uses the desideratives of the verbs 'to go', 'to read' and 'to intone' according to his Śaiva notion that a cognition is preceded by a precognitive desire, *parāmarśa* or *icchā*, which directs one's attention an object of thought. Otherwise these passages contain the same idea that after a vague, indeterminate cognition, percepts are combined and reflected in language as a unified object of a determinate cognition. Language as a form of thought carries out its synthetic function by means of association and dissocation ('*śaktyapoddharakalpanayā bhedasaṃsargāṃ na vijahāti*' in Bhartṛhari and '*yojanaviyojanarūpeṇa pratyavamarśena*' in Abhinavagupta). An object when unified in a determinate cognition possesses all of its qualifications and can cause a purposeful action, i.e. an action that culminates in an object, *artha*. (*sarvaviśeṣaṇaviśiṣṭe 'py' arthakriyākāriṇi* in Bhartṛhari and *pṛthubudhnodarākāraḥ śuklatvajātiyuktaguṇasamavāyī* in Abhinavagupta).

Intuition and determinate cognition

In the passage translated above, Abhinava in speaking of synthesis also elucidates the transition between the subtle presentation of *vimarśa* and its determinate form in concrete language which comes about later.

A mental object thought in ordinary language is a *vikalpa*. It is a cognition which has been chiseled and defined, out of a universal and encompassing state into a limited and determined cognition of 'what it is.' A distinction

śaktypoddhārakalpanayā bhedasaṃsargamātrāṃ na vijahāti.

between *vimarśa* and *vikalpa* is made in *IPV* 1.6.1-3 in the following manner: between a *vimarśa* and a *vikalpa* there intervenes a judgemental process as regards two alternatives (*dvayāpekśin*). The encompassing presentation, "this," is made determinate by means of exclusion (*vyapohana*) and positive judgement (*niścaya*), through intuitions of what it is and what it is not.[119] These intuitions arise between stages of pure awareness and verbally determined awareness, and Abhinava says,

> A mental construct is that which is delimited from everything around it, as if by chiselling; and because *vikalpa* is such (i.e., dependent on exclusion and identification), therefore, pure 'I' is a *vimarśa* and not a *vikalpa*.[120]

The basic elements of this theory of cognition furnish the groundwork Abhinava's explanation of aesthetic perceptions. First, Abhinava makes elaborate and carefully reasoned arguments in the *Abhinavabhāratī* and the *Locana* to show how an aesthetic perception differs from an ordinary cognition: an *alaukika* experience one gets from relishing the tastes of a poem does not transcend perception, but rather it is a mode of cognition which is extraordinary because of its unique means and goal. We cannot use an aesthetic cognition in the real world since it does not lead to successful performances of everyday activities. Aesthetic perceptions, moreover, arise from suggestiveness of poetic language and theatrical artifice. Thus, they entail a dialectic of true and false, correct and erroneous, cognitions.

---

119 *IPV* 1.6.3. "*tadatatpratibhābhājā mātraivātadvyapohanāt / tanniścayam ukto hi vikalpo ghaṭa ity ayam.*" See full passage in n. 121 below.

120 *IPV* 1.6.3, vol. 1, pp. 310-11. "*eṣa eva paritaśchedāt takṣaṇakalpāt paricchedaḥ.... yasmād evaṃ vikalpaḥ tato 'ham iti śuddho vimarśaḥ na vikalpaḥ.*"

Perceived in the aesthetic mode, such cognitions are real and valid, for they lead to delight--the successful goal of relishing a *rasa*.

The Śaiva theory of error is pertinent in accounting for a discrepancy between audience's actual perception of an actor and its consent to believe that he is Rāma without a feeling of having made a cognitive error. This dialectic of true and false cognitions underlies the aesthetic mode of experience: although we have a good judgement of truths and errors, we are persuaded to go along with the reality of what is ordinarily untrue. We slacken the rein on our imagination because truths and reality of poetry/drama are judged by criteria other than accomplishing an aim in the external world.

Vikalpa is a mental construction consisting of concrete words. It has an external reference when it is an ascertainment, and no external reference in the case of memory or imagination. Mental construction occurs in the realm of duality (*māyā*), through the process of synthesis which combines spatially contiguous parts into a whole, or temporally related events into a single entity. A synthesis combines trace impressions from memories of things experienced with present percepts. In contrast to a purely immediate presentation of *vimarśa*, a "this," in which the mind immediately grasps its object, a mental construct (*vikalpa*) arises after an intuition which excludes the counter-positive (*pratiyogin*) of what the object is not and identifies it as what it is. For example, a *vimarśa* of the 'I' is an immediate presentation of being, a continuous self-identity which has no counterpositive and does not involve alternatives of 'what it is' (*tat*), and 'what it is not' (*atat*). When the 'I' is combined with qualities, such as, "I am thin," or with events in time,

such as, "I who was young and am now old," this composite and verbally conceived person "I" is a product of mental construction. An immediate presentation, *vimarśa*, may be closely compared to Buddhists' description of *svalakṣaṇa*, a real thing directly and intuitively grasped. The Śaivas believe, however, that the mind can be conscious of mental events only when these are reflected by language, however subtle. The essence of language exists even in the most immediate mental image. This amounts to saying, then, that language is consciousness. In the course of becoming more concretely pronounced, an immediate presentation is mediated by an intuition which seizes the thought-object and determines it distinctly in a word as 'what it is not' and 'what it is.'

Verse 1.6.3 of the *IPV* defines the cognizer in relation to intuition and mental construction, and *IPV* 1.7. 1. identifies him with Maheśvara. The significance of these two verses for our purpose is that through intuition, and the capacity to represent by manifesting, the cognizer is a creator like God. *Kartṛ*, now synonymous with *jñātṛ*, is later explicated as *nirmātṛ*: the knower is the doer in the sense of a creator, a maker of objects. The *IPV* 1.6.3 describes an intuition of the cognizer as follows:

> **For, a mental construct which is this[notion], "pot," is said to be the judgement of what it is from an exclusion of what it is not, by the cognizer who experiences intuitions of what it is and what it is not.**
>
> Here, the cognizer is different from the cognition. He is shown to be the agent who is independent in respect to the content of cognition (*pramā*) because of [his] power to effect conjunctions and disjunctions, and so on. The cognizer possesses an inward manifestation of all objects. This manifestation, inasmuch as it has pure consciousness as its body (*cinmātraśarīro 'pi*), exists in a common substratum with it [pure

> consciousness] by the principle of a city in a mirror. This has also been stated. And thus, the cognizer experiences, which is to say that he enjoys, a manifestation of a pot, i.e., an intuition of what it is, and a manifestation of 'non-pot', i.e., an intuition of what it is not. Now, when it is in the realm of indeterminate cognition, this pot is of the nature of consciousness. Its body being the whole, it is full like consciousness itself; and there is no worldly usage through it. The cognizer, in causing a dualistic operation (*māyāvyāpāra*) to come forth, fragments even the full state of being; and he makes an exclusion in the form of negation of 'non-pot,' i.e., himself and cloth and so on. On the basis of this very exclusion, a judgement of a pot is pronounced as, "Just pot." Precisely because an object is in the form of a negation of other possible objects that it is delimitation (*pariccheda*), because it cuts off on all sides, like a chisel.[121]

Abhinava's commentary explains: a cognizer is distinct from the contents of cognition because he is empowered to associate and dissociate them. Being thus independent in regard to the contents of his cognition, he is shown to be the actor (*kartṛ*). To know, i.e., to actively shape one's own thoughts, is to act. And inasmuch as a manifestation is consciousness, it appears in consciousness as a city in a mirror. A mental image never becomes truly determinate without a verbal accompaniment. An intuition of

---

121 *IPV* 1.6.3, vol. 1, pp. 310-11. "*tadatatpratibhābhājā matraivātadvyapohanāt/ tanniścayanam ukto hi vikalpo ghaṭa ity ayam.*" *iha pramātā nāma pramāṇād atiriktaḥ pramāsu svatantraḥ saṃyojanaviyojanādyādhānavaśāt kartā darśitaḥ, tasya ca pramātur antaḥ sarvārthāvabhāsaḥ, cinmātraśarīro 'pi tatsāmānādhikaraṇyavṛttir api darpaṇa-nagaranyāyenāsti--ity api uktam. evaṃ ca tatpratibhāṃ ghaṭābhāsam, atatpratibhāṃ ca aghaṭābhāsaṃ pramātā bhajate--sevate tāvat, tadavikalpadaśāyāṃ citsvabhāvo 'sau ghaṭaḥ cidvad eva viśvaśarīraḥ pūrṇaḥ, na ca tena kaś cid vyavahāraḥ, tat māyāvyāpāram ullāsayan pūrṇam api khaṇḍayati bhāvam, tenāghaṭasyātmanaḥ paṭādeś cāpohanaṃ kriyate niṣedharūpam, tad eva vyapohanam āśritya tasya ghaṭasya niścayanam ucyate 'ghaṭa eva' iti, evārthasya saṃbhāvyamānāparavastu-niṣedharūpatvāt, eṣa eva paritaś chedāt takṣaṇa kalpāt paricchedaḥ."*

'not-pot,' 'a pot' excludes and identifies the perceived object, rendering determinate an indeterminate cognition.

In indeterminate cognition, a pot is just consciousness. Its body is universal. It is full, like consciousness, and by this [indeterminate cognition] there is no communication and transaction (*vyavahāra*) whatsoever. Then, bringing into view an operation in [the mode of] duality, it fragments that universal state. It effects an exclusion, which is negation of possible things. After exclusion, it ascertains that the object is 'a pot." Because an object's identity follows from a negation of other possible (*saṃbhāvyamāna*) objects (*vastu*), an intuition becomes a determinate knowledge through a process of delimitation (*pariccheda*): it cuts out a definable idea from its previous, vague and encompassing state.

Thus, an intuition mediates indeterminate and determinate cognitions. The Śaivas seem to mean by this that a *vimarśa* is an immediate reflection of pure consciousness's awareness of an object, i.e., a *parāmarśa* . This initial awareness is just consciousness itself. In order for a subjective awareness of an object to occur of the kind expressible as, "this is a pot," "I know this pot," the idea of the object must be set in an awareness of the subject as the knower. *IPV* 1.7.1 equates intuition with the cognizer who is ultimately God or Maheśvara. The knower and intuition are two aspects of consciousness that becomes self-aware through object-representation. Intuition is two-faced: the inward-facing side is homogeneous consciousness, namely, the Cognizer, and its objective side takes up sequences of things that are objects of knowledge. The cognizer is a boundless and sequenceless consciousness; intuition is tinged by a succession of *padārtha* s--categories of

things, or meanings of words. To be more precise, like a reflection on the surface of water, intuition is tinged by series of things without itself being sequential. Abhinava's commentary glosses the phrase, "*pratibhāti ghaṭaḥ*" so as to say that intuition rests in the cognizer rather than in the cognized object.

The Śaiva philosophers use the concept of intuition how a homogeneous consciousness can be aware of or produce a variety of thoughts. It also explains how the cognizing mind may be active and willful, which is to say that neither the choice nor the identity of an object in awareness is governed by an empirical thing. In cognition, a volitional impulse brings certain sense-experiences to attention, and an intuition of possible categories of things determines how and what an initial presentation is to be known as. An intuition mediates the subjective and objective, the pure cognizer and pure object, by bringing subjective components of cognition to fullfilling the production of a cognizable object in the mind. Consciousness, with its intuition of possibilities for a determinate cognition, actively creates mental images rather than passively perceives impressions of objects through the senses.

Imagination and valid knowledge

Abhinava's concept of intuition has thus far been described in connection with the Śaiva philosophical explanation of how a cognition arises. Relevant links between Bhartṛhari's philosophy and Śaivism have illuminated their respective theories of cognition. For both schools, consciousness is

metaphorically termed 'light' (*prakāśa*) because it apprehends and reflects back, determinately grasping an object as a definite, speakable, thing; and the form of this reflection is language. In this way, homogeneous and indivisible consciousness can represent to us a world of multiplicity whose appearances are arranged and structured by 'efficiencies' primarily in the forms of time and space.

Abhinava speaks of a mental construct as a willful synthesis out of memory, trace impressions and sense percepts.[122] Such a construct is new and vivid, being an inward image projected so as to appear external. This external manifestation is innate (*naisargika* or *svātmīya*). The mind is capable of projecting any image at will; the term 'innate' signifies an immediacy which distinguishes a mental construct from other mental

---

122 *IPV* 1.6.6, vol. 1, pp. 325-326. "*sā yojanā sarvā vikalpanā vilapa eva, na tu śuddhaḥ pratyavamarśaḥ....bhinne'pi katham anusaṃdhānam iti ced āha 'saṃskārāt' prāktanānubhavakṛtavāsanāprabodhajasmṛtivaśāt, iti yāvat, prāṇe balābalavaśād anusaṃdhiḥ, buddhau jñānasukhāditāratamyāt, śūnye vaitatyāvaitatyayogāt, ayam api vikalpa eva, evaṃ 'sa evāyaṃ ghaṭaḥ' iti 'pi vikalparvaṃ mantavyam.*" "Thus joining is always an imaginative process (*kalpanā*) which is a a mental construct, but it is not a pure reflection. [An objection follows.] Regarding [an imaginative process], since it is implied that a qualification, and so on, is the cause of the body, because the body has been manifested before differentiatedly, so even now its manifestation is continuous. For if the body is entirely full, one who sees synthesis as the lack of interruption should make it an, "I-this" [continuity]. Then who would say that this realm of *Sadāśiva* is the realm of *vikalpa*, inasmuch as there is continuity precisely when there is synthesis? [*Sadāśiva* is the realm of *vimarśa* where the presentation is predominantly in the form of "This-I."] And since it is differentiated, how is there synthesis? If [there is this objection], he says from trace impressions , because of the power of memory born from the awakening of the trace impressions made by former experiences. This is the meaning. From the power of strength and weakness there is synthesis in [life's] breath; from a gradation of knowledge and feelings such as happy, and so on, [there is synthesis] in the mind; from the presence of extension and non-extension, in the void. This is also *vikalpa*. The synthesis of a pot and so on in this manner, "This is really this pot," must be considered a mental construct as well."

processes such as a memory. The latter mental event arises from trace impressions of former experiences and therefore appears to have taken place in another time. A mental construct, which is a projection as external of an internal appearance (i.e., mental image or an idea), is vivid, present and without any intervention by trace impressions.[123] In *IPV* 1.6.10, Abhinava states that a mental construction can be purely imaginative, i.e., a mental projection corresponding to no object of direct perception. This imagination roams about, arises, and changes independently through its own impulse, without any dependence on others' urging. Such a projection of imagined appearances is innate (*naisargika*): Although no one has ever seen an elephant with tens and hundreds of pairs of trunks, a mental construct can make it appear to stand here and now (*tātkālikam*) in the realm of the mind, which is a clear mirror of thought (*antaḥkaraṇabhūmau svacchadhīdarpaṇāyām*).[124] Since creatures vividly imagine things without having empirically perceived them and because thoughts are freely constructed by the subject, Abhinava concludes that,

> any creature from a worm to Brahman, being filled with the activities of life, innately possesses the power of knowledge which is image-projection and the power of action which is imagination (*ullekhana*). Therefore, on this plane it is impossible even to suppose a dependence on a ready-made creation fashioned by a different god. In this sense, one's own sovereignty exactly should be recognized clearly, which sovereignty is characterized by one's independence of knowledge and action as in the phrases, "he knows," "he acts."[125]

---

123 *IPV* 1.6.9, vol. 1, pp 335-337. "*anubhavajñānasya 'idaṃ nīlam' iti antaravabhāsaṃ bahirābhāsayataḥ svā'ntarbhāvābhāso naisargikaḥ*"

124 *IPV* 1.6.10, vol. 1, PP. 338-339.

125 *IPV* 1.6.11, vol. 1, p. 341-343.

But if the synthesizing mind can fashion any image it wills, what truth or basis for rational activity is there in the world? To this Abhinava says that there are no fixed, empirical criteria of truths. Inference is a provisional rather than ultimate means of valid knowledge: an inferred knowledge must depend on two perceptions occurring at once, a present perception of smoke on the mountain and previous perceptions of seeing a smoke and fire together. Likewise is the sublation of a previous mistaken knowledge by a subsequent correct one. In making an inference or in sublating an error, we rely on past experiences and conventions, which in turn depend on individual and collective memories having correspondence with a stable world of nature as ordained by Śiva. Inference is provisionally useful but is far from being a standard of correctness superior to direct perception.[126]

Here, Abhinava does not mean that there is no rationality or discourse in the world. On the contrary, it is only because there is rational discourse (*vyavahāra*) that there are criteria of truth and means of knowledge by which judgements of true and false are made. Inference does not depend only on an intrinsically true nature of an object, but operates in a framework of conventions of mutual understanding and transaction. When inferring fire from smoke, the subject must unify a present perception of smoke with ideas about fire from memories of his previous experiences.

The measure of truth, therefore, exists in the unity of the self who knows and acts. Consciousness is constantly and ceaselessly active at synthetic

---

126 See arguments in *IPV* 2.4, that validity of an inference is not based on empirical objects but rather on the knower's past knowledge and experiences, conventions and a stability of natural world (*niyati*).

thoughts replacing one another in turn. A knowledge is deemed valid relative to another knowledge; and only because there is one holder of all perceptions and cognitions, who joins and disjoins, them that there is a notion of valid kowledge. Even though there are no external criteria of truth, there is an internal coherence and connection between kindred things. Internal coherence is the defining characteristic of sentience.[127] On the cosmic level as on the level of individual consciousness, there are no outside absolute criteria of truth, no ready-made world apart from a unity of consciousness in which kindred things are united by their conceptual affinity. It is this notion of knowledge as imagination, valid because of an internal coherence rather than empirical correspondence, that Abhinava brings to bear on his theory of aesthetic perception.

Perception and Apperception

Abhinavagupta likens apperception (*anuvyavasāya*) to the theater (*anuvyavasāyavat viṣayīkāryaṃ nāṭyam*). His meaning of apperception is is different from that in the Naiyāyika usage, i.e., that percepts received through the senses are gathered in the mind and cognized in the soul; the cognition is then known in a subsequent moment of self-awareness. The process is expressed thus, "This is a pot," "I know the pot." For the Mīmāṃsakas, the object, knowledge, and the cognizer are known together as one; thus, there can be no apperception because the knower and knowledge are inseparable. The Śaivas take a different approach to knowledge. It is stated in the *Śivadṛṣṭi* that knowing in itself is an activity.[128] In the later

[127] *IPV* 1.7.2, vol. 1 pp. 356.

systematic philosophy of the *Īśvarapratyabhijñā*, knowing is an active manifestation on the part of the consciousness, and action is the bringing about of this inner design consisting of knowledge in the external world.[129]

Abhinava's use of *anuvyavasāya*[130] is furnished in connection with an explanation of a synthesis of cognitions into a complex idea and an action. In this regard, it is linked with *pramāṇa*, the means which produces a single, new cognition. *Pramāṇa* is telelogically defined as the knowledge that persists uninterrupted until it serves its desired purpose.[131] A desired purpose is the limiting definition of a *pramāṇa* because Abhinava wants to say, first, that an action consisting of a series of manifestations in the external world and comprising parameters of time and space, is unified in the subject; and, second, because an action of complex manifestations (*ābhāsa* s) must be unified, the unifier must be one *saṃvid* which is continuous in indeterminate stages through determinate cognition and

128 *ŚD* 1.23-24, p. 16.

129 *IPV* 2.4.4, vol. 2, p. 159. "*evam ekā kriyā saiṣā sakramāntarbahiḥ sthitiḥ/ ekasyaivobhayākārasahiṣṇor upapāditā*." "Thus action is one. It is a sequential state, internal and external, accomplished by a single [subject] who can take both forms."

130 *IPV* 2.2.3, vol. 2, p. 43. "*paścād bhāvinaṃ vyavasāyaṃ niścayātmakaṃ vikalpakaṃ anuvyavasāyaśabdavācyaṃ vidadhad antaḥkaraṇam etān kriyāsambandhādi-vikalpān sampādayati*." "A determination in the nature of an ascertainment and a mental construct, occurring afterward, expressible by the word 'apperception,' and orienting the mind causes mental constructs to acquire relations with actions and so on."

131 *IPVV* 2.3.1-2, vol. 2, p. 68. 2.3.1 "*idametādṛg ity evaṃ yadvaśād vyavatiṣṭhate/ vastu pramāṇaṃ tat so 'pi svābhāso 'bhinavodaya*." 2.3.2 "*so 'ntas tathāvimarśātmā deśakālādyabhedini/ ekābhidhānaviṣaye mitir vastuny abādhitā*." "An object that is resolved from the force of [perceiving] thus, "this is such," is a valid knowledge. Since it is a one's own manifestation, it rises ever anew." "Being inward, consisting of a presentation as such in an object of a single intention, which object has no division in time and space, it is [substantive] knowledge (*miti*) which is not sublated in respect of the object."

culminates in the agent's carrying out of the action. The *saṃvid* manifests knowledge as a series of *ābhāsa* s connected by various relations, and action as what is desired to be achieved by the agent, who accordingly uses appropriate instruments to bring about externally his desired purpose. Validity is not fixed but relative to a prior and less perfect, or later and more perfect, knowledge. A particular knowledge is relative to all manifestations of the full consciousness which unifies and makes experiences coherent in respect of a particular purpose. *Anuvyavasāya*, in this connection, is a function of the mind (*manas*) that creates coherence by unifying percepts with abstract relations into a positive determination.[132] It is a function analogous to an *anusaṃdhāna* in *vikalpa*, differing only in that an *anuvyavasāya* arranges relations (*kāraka*) while *anusaṃdhāna* arranges the whole in a determinate cognition. Apperception (*anuvyavasāya*) is necessary in valid knowledge, inasmuch as serving a purpose defines valid knowledge and the latter requires ideas of relation. Abhinava concludes that an action which attains its object must proceed from a cognizer's power to relate distinct and discrete cognitions into a web of coherence.[133]

---

[132] *IPV* 2.2.3, vol. 2, p. 41. "*taddvayālambanā etā mano 'nuvyavasāyi sat/ karoti mātṛvyāpāramayīḥ karmādikalpanāḥ.*" "The [sensuous] mind, [as opposed to the intellective *buddhi*] being the apperceiver, creates these thoughts (*kalpanā*) of action and so on, which are operations of the cognizer [indeterminate cognitions] [and] which depend on these two [unity and diversity]."

[133] *IPV* 2.3.7, vol. 3, pp. 136-138. "*pṛthag dīpaprakāśānāṃ srotasāṃ sāgare yathā/ aviruddhāvabhāsānām eva tathaikadhī.*" "Like separate lights in a lamp [or] streams in a river, so is the insight of a unity, possessing a single thing as its object of action, of uncontradicted manifestations." Abhinava's comment, "*pṛthak ye dīpaprakāśāḥ teṣāṃ saṃbandhi yad ekaṃ sāgare srotasāṃ ca yad ekaṃ vastu tena kāryā yathā aikyadhīḥ tathā aviruddhā ye avabhāsā ghaṭalohitakāñcanādayaḥ teṣāṃ saṃbandhi yad ekaṃ svalakṣaṇaṃ tatkāryā aikyadyīr iti saṃbandhaḥ aikyadhiyā--pratibhāso vimarśo arthakriyā ca iti*

In the theatrical context, apperception, in addition to being an after-cognition, is also the coherence-creating function: the mind arranges present

svīkṛtam." "Just as a single thing possessing relations of [i.e. illuminated by] lamp-lights, and a single substance of streams in a river, creates an effect which is an insight of unity, just so an isight of unity has as its effect a single bare particular (*svalakṣaṇa*) possessing the relations of appearances of 'pot,' 'metal,' 'gold,' and so on. This is the meaning. Thus, it is accepted that through an insight of unity there is a representation, which is an appearance, and a purposeful action." Cf. *Abhinavabhāratī.* The same reasoning is attributed to Śaṅkuka in order to explain how a spectator perceives actors and actions on stage. Abhinava represents Śrī Śaṅkuka as saying that an aesthetic perception is an insight (*dhī*) consisting of a stream of contradictory awarenesses (*viruddhabuddhisambhedad avivecitasaplava*). Abhinava quotes a verse from the *Pramāṇavarttika* to the effect that even a false knowledge can lead to a purposeful action (*arthakriyāpi mithyājñānadṛṣṭā*). No doubt, Abhinava describes an opponent's viewpoint on the basis of Abhinava's own critical perspective, which is that the mind arranges bare percepts into a unified idea according to some aim or purpose and that even a false cogition can lead to a purposeful action. R. S. Nagar, ed., *Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharatamuni,* with the commentary *Abhinavabhāratī* by Abhinavaguptācārya, vol. 1 (2d ed. Delhi: Parimal Publications), 1988, p. 272.

On *samanvaya,* Abhinava says in *IPV* 1.7.2, vol. 1, p. 356-357. "*yadi amī bhāvā nīlasukhādaya uhyamānā ekasmin 'aham' iti pramātṛrūpe mahāsaṃvitsamudre pratitiṣṭhanti ābhimukhyena viśrāntim bhajante, tata eṣu parasparam samanvayarūpam yat jñāteyam tat upapattyā ghaṭate, jñātīnām bhāvaḥ. tacchabdapravṛttinimittam parasparam jānīyuḥ iti, karma ca anyonyayogakṣemodvahanātmakam jñāteyam, tac ca samanvayābhiprāyeṇa iha darśitam, na jaḍānām svataḥ samanvayaḥ kadācid api iti pratipādayitum.*"

"If these states, blue, happy, and so on, as they are being borne settle in one great ocean of *saṃvid,* i.e., the one cognizer, "I," they come to rest presently. Thus, an affinity (*jñāteya*) in the form of coherence [i.e., a mutual logical connection] among them (*eṣu parasparam samanvayarūpam*) arises as the state [of being] kindred things. The reason for using the word [affinity (*jñāteya*)], is [to indicate] that they should know one another. And an object of action is an affinity consisting of a stream which allows the joining of one with another, and this has been shown here through the meaning of 'coherence' (*samanvaya*, lit. logical connection), in order to establish that there is never a logical connection in itself between inert things." This is to say that making sense out of bare percepts is a function of the mind of a single cognizer, rather than a function inherent in empirical objects.

percepts into imaginative constructs conducive to the dramatic goal. When going to the theater, one has a desire or intention not do something real ("*na me kiṃcid pāramārthikaṃ kartavyam...*"[134]), but, rather, to enjoy oneself in communion with all others in the audience in seeing the wonderful sights and sounds of the theater. The purpose achieved by the theater is bliss, i.e., the relishing of the *rasa*. This uninterrupted continuity between an idea and its culmination in action, made coherent by relations in apperception, governing a series of separate perceptions and experiences in *saṃvid*, makes the knowledge gained in the theater valid. Its validity rests on the fact that the theater, from the perspective of an individual viewer or of the audience as a whole, is an unobstructed continuum of one-pointed (*ekāgra*) and coherent (*samyagsaṃbaddha*) imagination; one knowledge persists from the beginning to the end and accomplishes its purpose. That knowledge is an aesthetic experience achieved by a valid means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*).[135]

The unifier as a cognizer and agent of action, whose unification terminates in accomplishing of an effect, is the *saṃvid* consisting of *prakāśa* and *vimarśa*. In the concept of *saṃvid*, Abhinava provides the logic of the manner in which consciousness moves from one mental event to another, above the substrata of subconscious memories and indeterminate cognitions that constantly arise into the composition of conscious mental images, while the mind (*manas*) unifies these various events and images into a single coherent stream of thought terminating in achieving a purposeful activity.

---

134 *Abh* 1.1, Nagar ed., p. 35

135 *IPV* 2.3.7, pp. 137-138.

The distinction of consciousness and self-consciousness is evident in this regard: while percepts from the senses and memories raised out of the subconsciousness (trace impressions) are synthesized into a determinate cognition which comprises a stage of representation (*parāmarśa*) governed by a precognitive impulse (*icchā*), determinate cognitions as distinct and separate representations in themselves now consciously perceived have no coherence. Coherence is a combination in which distinct mental events (*ābhāsa*) are in relation (*saṃbandha*) or logical connection (*samanvaya*) to one another, and there are such relations and connections because the whole stream of events tend towards one single purpose.[136] In this situation, each mental construct (*vikalpa*) does not stand alone but is perceived in another organizing level of consciousness that puts them in relation to one another;

---

[136] *IPV* 1.7.2, vol. 1, p. 356, and 2.2.1-7, vol. 2, p. 33-63. See especially 2.2.7, p. 58 "*evam evārthasiddhiḥ syān mātur arthakriyārthinaḥ bhedābhedavatārthena tena na bhrāntir īdṛśī*." "Thus, indeed, the agent seeking a successful action may accomplish his goal through a purpose which is divided and unified. Therefore, there is no such error." This 'error' means the world of *vyavahāra* which notably in Vedānta and Buddhist systems is construed as an epistemological error. Utpala says the phenomenal world is real, *satya*, and not an error, *bhrānti*. Chapter 2 of *IPV* 2 is devoted to showing that mentally constructed concepts of relations are real and not erroneous because they are conventions that support the functioning of the world. They are real because they are stable and useful "*satyāḥ sthairyopayogābhyām*." *IPV* 2.2.1., vol. 2, p. 33. The world is real because it is stable and useful. Thus, using the notion that conceptual relations and logical relations are real because they are formed by and for convention, *vyavahāra*, which is real, "*evaṃ ca ābhāsātmani asmin asaṃvedyam api ābhāsāntaraṃ sāmānyasaṃbandharūpatayā anupraviṣṭam, anyathā na kathaṃ cid vyavahāraḥ iti sakaladeśakāladaśāpuruṣopayogī yadi ayaṃ vyavahāro na satyaḥ tarhi na anyasya satyatvaṃ vidmaḥ iti na atra bhrāntiḥ iti bhramitavyam.* *IPV* 2.2.7, p. 63. "And thus even in the manifestation itself, another manifestation is agreed upon as logical connections and relations, although it is not perceptible. Otherwise, in no way can there be an ordinary world. And if this world, being of benefit to humans in all places, time and circumstances, are not real, then, we know of nothing else real. So it is not to be mistaken as an error."

and at this level consciousness is aware of mental constructs as elements in its cognition, i.e., as *ābhāsa* s that are possibilities in a combination.

Perhaps mindful of a difference between his own notion of apperception and that of the logicians, Abhinava says "*anuvyavasāyavad viṣayīkāryaṃ nāṭyam*"[137] Logic defines an apperception, *anuvyavasāya,* as a direct perception possessing as its scope a determination: "*yathā ghaṭajñān-āntaraṃ ghaṭam aham jānāmi iti mānasaṃ jñānam. 2 jñātatāvabhāsakaṃ brahmacaitanyam iti māyāvādinaḥ.*"[138] "as the mental perception, "I know the pot," immediately after the knowledge of a pot; and 2. according to the school of illusion, it is Brahma-consciousness manifesting the state of being known." The *Nyāyakośa* also gives a definition of *vyavasāya* as a knowledge which is made an object of knowledge, which is to say a knowledge of something [perceived] before (*pūrvajñāna*). In the statement that a direct perception consists in ascertainment (*Gautamanyāyasūtra* 1.1.4), for example: here, the immediate perception of a pot, understood by an ascertainment, "I perceive a pot," occurring immediately after the direct, visual, sensory perception of a pot, is an ascertainment in the form of a determinate ccognition. The commentary by Vātsyāyana says that everywhere the knower by means of his senses has an ascertainment in regard to a sense-object. An apperception (*anuvyavasāya* or literally after-ascertainment) occurs by means of the mind.[139]

---

[137] This appears in the Nagar edition. The Baroda edition, GOS 37, has "*anuvyavasāyaviṣayīkāryaṃ nāṭyam*"

[138] Bhīmācārya Jhalakīkar, *Nyāyakośa*, Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 49 (Rev. and re-ed. by Vāsudev Shāstrī Abhyankar, Poona: The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1978), p. 35.

[139] *IPV* 2.2.3, vol. 2, p.41-2. "*taddvyālambanā etā mano 'nuvyavasāyi sat/ karoti*

Abhinava's definition is similar; but in the scheme of his conception of *saṃvid* as the whole of consciousness that encompasses complex mental phenomena, *anuvyavasāya* implies in one sense that the state of knowledge is [as if] perceived by another state of consciousness which is its substratum. Abhinava treats this sort of apperception as a level of *parāmarśa,* a state of mental representation which rests (*viśrānta*) on another. He says in *IPV* 1.5.10 that

> *parāmarśa* is the place of rest (*viśrāntisthānā*). The final one is the ultimate, and that in a form of such as "I". But what contradiction is there [in there being] an intermediate state of rest, as one says of the roots of a tree in the going to a village, because the former is created in dependence of the latter. Also, since the intermediate *parāmarśa,* "because this blue [arises] by that [cause], there is this blue," rests on a basic *parāmarśa* "I," it is established precisely that repose consists in the self. To say that "I know this blue" amounts in essence to saying that "I illuminate [the blue].[140]

Saṃvid is postulated as a consciousness identical to the Lord in possessing the powers of knowledge and action resting on the will of the agent. If consciousness is one homogeneous entity, Śaiva philosophers seek

---

mātṛvyāpāramayīḥ karmādikalpanāḥ."

140 *IPV* 1.5.17, pp. 278-9. The term *parāmarśa,* an object-awareness governed by a particular precognitive impulse (*icchā*), represents the possibility of intermediate representations, which is based on a more basic representation in which it is manifested. An example is that the ideas 'pot' and 'cloth' are *parāmarśa*s which are represented in the "I" *parāmarśa.* The latter which consists of the a personal identity, such as being a potter who desires to make a pot, and so on, is a representation in the pure "I" or "*śuddhāhaṃbhāva.*" Other passages in the *IPV* explicating this term are 1.5.10, vol. 1., pp. 236ff.; 2.3.9, vol. 2, p. 113; 2.4.2, vol. 2, pp. 203-4, and others.

to explain how diverse things such as experiences and actions are formed by a single agent who is *saṃvid*. Such a consciousness is independent as to what it wants to manifest and sovereign as to how it manifests, in subjecting thought-formations to parameters of time and form (*mūrtikriyā*).[141] It has the freedom and power to shape mental objects. Abhinava says of *vimarśa*, *saṃvid*'s reflective aspect, that it is capable of being all things: it makes another oneself, and it makes oneself another; it unifies both into one, and

---

141 *IPV* 2.1.5-7, vol. 2, pp. 16, 20. "*mūrtivaicitryato deśakramam ābhāsayaty asau/ kriyāvaicitryanirbhāsāt kālakramam apīśvaraḥ*" "That Lord manifests a sequence of space as varieties of forms, and a sequence of time as well through an appearance of varieties of actions." The theory is that the Lord as the ultimate *saṃvid* is not differentiated but projects differences in the form of time and space through his power of reflection or representation, i.e., *vimarśa*. *IPV* 3.1.1, vol. 2, pp. 214-216," *evam antarbahir vṛttiḥ kriyā kālakramānugā/ mātur eva tadanyonyāviyukte jñānakarmaṇī.*" "Thus the knower alone possesses the activity of inward and outward modes conforming (corresponding) to time and space; therefore knowledge and action are not unconnected with one another." Abhinava's comments (p. 215), "*tasya pramātur eva jñānaśaktivapuṣo dharmaḥ. tat iti tasmād aviyuktam jñānam kriyā ca. jñānam vimarśānuprāṇitam, vimarśa eva ca kriyeti.*" "The knower alone has the property consisting the power of knowledge. Therefore : therefore knowledge and action are not unconnected. Knowledge is brought to life by *vimarśa*, and *vimarśa* itself is action." The idea is that all perceptions of external things and subjectively originated thoughts, which occur in the sequences of time and space (as action and form), would be scattered and unconnected without a single unifying subject who appears as one in all discontinuous mental events; although the subject, *saṃvid*, is not differentiated, *vimarśa*, the reflection is put to parameters of time and space in the course of blooming forth into concretely verbalized mental constructs. *IPV* 2.1.6-7, pp. 20. "*sarvatrābhāsabhedo 'pi bhavet kālakramākaraḥ/ vicchinnabhāsaḥ śūnyāder mātur bhātasya no sakṛt.// deśakramo 'pi bhāveṣu bhāti mātur mitātmanaḥ/ svātmeva svātmanā pūrṇā bhāvā bhānty amitasya tu.*" "Everywhere, discrete appearances, having time-sequence as their origin, would be discontinuous, if the cognize,r consisting of the void, and so on, is not illuminated as one.// Although things appear to be in a spatial sequence to a limited knower, they appear full to the unlimited knower as the self by means of the self." This is to say that because appearances are formed by subjective forms of time and space, they require a single cognizer to give them a sense of unity and coherence.

having unified into one, it cancels both.[142] He means, very probably, that representations (*vimarśa*) consisting in synthesis project externality as the world of objects in my consciousness, and internality as the 'I' who perceive the world; a representation combines the object and subject in a single cognition, and cancels both notions of objectivity and subjectivity. Or, it cancels a particular representation and synthesizes another mental event. These stages of representation are evident in Śaiva epistemeological schema, beginning with *Śiva, Śakti, Īśvara, Sadāśiva, Sadvidyā,* and so on, in which the ultimate level of complete and undifferentiated awareness is split off into an incipient self-awareness in the *Śakti* stage, followed by an awakening (*unmeṣa*) to objectivity in the *Īśvara* "That-I" awareness; this is in turn followed by a "I-that" of the *Sadāśiva* stage in which subjectivity predominates, and the *Sadvidyā* level in which the subjectivity and objectivity are in equal balance.[143] Inasmuch as it is subtly verbal and governed by a desire, *vimarśa* contains in it the object of a purposeful action for which it is conceived, and develops into a *vikalpa* ; the mind relates distinct manifestations into a coherent whole.

---

142 *IPV* 1.5.13, vol. 2, p. 252. " *vimarśo hi sarvaṃsahaḥ... ityevaṃsvabhāvaḥ.* "

143 *IPV* 3.1, see n. 141, and vol. 3 (tr.), pp.190-200. This chapter devoted to the nature of the subject describes gradations of experiences, differentiated by the *vimarśa* power of reflective presentation of pure consciousness which is Śiva. These stages are also quickly outlined in 1.5.14, vol. 2, pp. 254-5, where the *Sadāśiva* stage corresponds with *paśyantī* level of Speech. See also 3.1 for a scheme of corresponding epistemological and ontological realms and their presiding deities. A practical illustration of levels of presentations may be made as follows: in cognizing a pot, a person must first be attentive. "Ah, a pot," " *ayaṃ ghaṭa,* " he says. The tacit subjectivity in this cognition may be expressed as an apperception when he reflects, "I am seeing a pot." Or, if he is totally absorbed in a fascinating pot, the sense of I-this and this-I disappears, and he is intensely aware of just 'pot.' The latter is a single-focused, *ekāgra,* perception.

Verse 2.2.3 of the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* describes how the mind (*manas*) is an apperceiver through its function of creating coherence:

> **The mind, being the apperceiver, creates these ideas of actions and so on in dependence on these two [unity and diversity], which constructions are the operations of the cognizer.**
>
> It has been established previously that, in the world, a living being is the cognizer, who in being self-conscious is like an inward string of a garland of knowledge. It has been ascertained also that he is independent. Being of a pure nature, he is Śiva; but in the realm of duality, being of a limited nature he is cattle. Thus, when his mind (*manas*) blooms forth, the blooming is vivid in the realm of mental constructs (*vikalpabhūmikā*). Because the arising [of an awareness] in the realm of *Sadāśiva* and *Īśvara* pertains to a sensuous indeterminate [cognition], the operation of *vimarśa* is of that which is not external to an indeterminate cognition. The determination that comes about afterward, consisting of an ascertainment, is determinate. It is expressed by the term "*anuvyavasāya*," and the mind in effecting [apperception] brings about the mental constructs of action, relation, and so on. And these mental constructs depend on two things in the forms of unity and diversity...[144]

The aesthetic experience is a particularly good illustration of the process described above: in it, determinate images are constructed from trace impressions and percepts. The modality of this experience, i.e., that it is an aesthetic experience and not a mundane one (*laukika, vyavahārika*), is governed and made coherent by a more inclusive awareness of the theatrical context. The aim of the theatrical context, in turn, makes possible the contemplative attitude of savoring.

In this aesthetic experience, with *saṃvid* as the whole, there are levels

---

144 *IPV* 2.2.3, vol. 2, pp. 42-43. See also Pandey's translation, *IPV*, vol. 3 p. 131.

of perceptions, of which *anuvyavasāya* is the coherence-creating function. We see in Abhinava's analysis an integral picture of the mental life in which particulars are united by means of mental categories such as action, relation, universal, substance, place and time, within a governing objective.[145] A coherence of a series of mental events implies diversity, i.e., particulars within the series, combined in unity through ideas of relations that humans have conventionally instituted so that practical purposes in everyday life are able to be accomplished. The cognizer must unite levels of mental functions in order to carry out actions in practical life.[146] Indeed, the world consists of knowledge and action in *vyavahāra*, which is based on the routinization of abstract concepts that persist because they are useful for the continuity of interpersonal communication in society. This unification of distinct ideas presupposes the unity of an individual consciousness as well as a unity of the world, through which unities invariable occurrences are verbally described in routinized and conventional terms.[147] Therefore, according to Śaiva systematic philsophy, one must posit the cognizer of the nature of *saṃvid*, whose action consists in making external his inward thoughts and designs.[148]

---

145 *IPV* 2.2.3, vol. 2, pp. 46-47. "*tatra ca ayaṃ saṃvidavataraṇakramo yat kriyāśakter eva ayaṃ sarvo visphāraḥ.*" "And in this (talk of provisional reality--Bhāskara), this world is a succession of a descent of *saṃvid* in that everything is an expansion of just the power of action."

146 *IPV* 2.2.1, vol. 2, pp. 33-36; vol. 3, (tr.), pp. 128-9.

147 *IPV* 2.3.8, vol. 2, p. 108-109. "*aviśiṣṭo yady api vahnyābhāso deśakālābhāsapramukhaiḥ ābhāsaiḥ... tatra kiṃ pramāṇāntareṇa.*"

148 *IPV*, vol. 1, p. 422, "*saṃvidāṃ jñānānāṃ aikyena vinā lokaprasiddhiḥ lokamārgaḥ sarvo vyavahāro na saṃbhavet. saṃbhavati ca ayaṃ tasmāt aikyam āsām... sa eva ca pramātā ucyate iti sthitam*"

Chapter 4

Intuition in Poetics

Throughout the tradition of literary criticism, texts on poetics regularly cite *pratibhā* as the source of the poet's extraordinary ability to create beautiful poetry. It is conceived as an inborn genius, a divine gift or inspiration, without which no poem of worth will come forth even if a poet has the requisite skill and practice. Such treatises, searching for causes of beauty and obstacles to poetic excellence, provide an education for a would-be poet as well as for readers. To that extent, they reflect overarching conceptions of "poetness" (*kavitva*) and changing trends in literary works.

Gerow describes the historical process that culminates in Ānandavardhana's theory of poetics[149] as a rapprochement between the two art forms--poetry and drama. Having lost court patronage, Sanskrit drama withered into a written art form while Sanskrit poetry became increasingly vernacularized in devotional religious movements. Consequently, the famed critic, in redefining the subject matter of poetry and poetics, brought drama into the proper realm of poetry. In this process,

---

[149] According to Gerow, an articulation of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*'s notions of *rasa* in poetry and the linkage of the notions of *rasa* and *alaṃkāra* are two out of three ways of understanding the importance of Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka*. Edwin Gerow, *Indian Poetics* (*IP*), in *History of Indian Literature*, vol. 5, fasc. 3, Jan Gonda, ed. (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977) pp. 252-253.

the language of poetry is made to realize its multivalence and full capacity of expressiveness, as well as the "integrative quality" of drama.[150]

Ānanda lived in an epoch that was kind to its poets and other intellectuals. The scholar-loving court of Kashmir, from the reign of Jayāpīḍa onward, provided necessary patronage for the great surge of literary activities recorded by Kalhaṇa. We find mentioned in the *Rājataraṅginī*, great poets and poeticians of this historical period,[151] many of whom Abhinava often cites by name. At the height of its political and cultural glory, the literary tradition of Kashmir made a great impact on Indian poetics. With the *Dhvanyāloka*, Ānandavardhana revolutionized the conception of poetry and of the poetic mode of communication. Devoting the last *uddyota* to *pratibhā*, Ānanda describes the endlessness of the 'modern' poet who keeps a *rasa* in his heart as the goal of the creative process, while employing the suggestive function, *dhvani*, of poetic language to achieve this aim. Poetry no longer appeals to the aesthetics of the intellect alone, but rather the poet can devise fresh and original literary works culminating in joy, *prīti*, of an emotional nature in the sympathetic and sensitive reader.

Ānanda's treatment of the poet's *pratibhā*, following a long tradition of its usage in a general way as the poet's genius, is significantly integrated with a structural re-orientation of hierarchical poetic elements and of poetic communication. Although Ānanda's conception of poetry as a 'soul' and the suggestive function of poetic language had been foreshadowed by Vāmana

---

150 Gerow, *IP*, p. 252.

151 *RT*, vol. 1: 4.495-497, p. 166, Vāmana and Udbhaṭa; 5.34 Muktākaṇa, Śivasvāmin, Ānandavardhana, Ratnākara; 5.66, p. 195, Bhaṭṭa Kallaṭa; 4.704, p. 184, Śaṅkuka. M. Aurel Stein, tr., *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī: A Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir* (*RT*), vol. 1, (Repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979).

and Udbhaṭa, the two great court literati before him, it was his work that effectively determined later views on Indian aesthetics. To that extent, a modern critic such as De finds it impossible that the idea of the soul of poetry has not always been implied, and few critics of Sanskrit literature today would wholeheartedly support the notion that aesthetic emotions are inferred by the audience upon hearing a poem or seeing a play. Ānanda's revolution is a historical process, which entails a new definition of the relation of the poet with his work, and the poet with his reader. This linkage is provided in part by Ānanda's concept of a poet's imagination and the poet's creative control over a literary piece. The development of *pratibhā*, therefore, is to be examined in the light of Ānanda's language theory and his thesis that *rasadhvani* is the 'soul' of poetry. The bond between the poet and his *sahṛdaya* suggested by Ānanda is strengthened by the logic of aesthetic perception that Abhinava furnishes in the *Locana* and the *Abhinavabhāratī*.

Problematics of the 'soul' of poetry

The style of Sanskrit poetics does not lend itself to lengthy expositions on the subjective aesthetic experiences of a poet and his reader such as one may find in Western literary criticism of certain periods. Short verses in the form of *sūtra* s or *kārikā* s concisely define genres and constitutive elements of good poetry. In spite of this mneomonic brevity and by comparing analytical categories appearing in different texts, it is possible to detect "schools" and innovations within the tradition.

Early poetics texts, up to Vāmana and Udbhaṭa, speak metaphorically of

the entity, "poetry," as a body, and the few lines devoted to the description of this body evince an attitude of poets in their self-consciousness as brethen whose common immortal glory consists in the "body" of their verses.[152]

Vāmana at the court of king Jayāpīḍa was the first to mention the soul of poetry as a distinct cause of beauty, "*Rītir ātmā kāvyasya.*"[153] Ānanda turns the soul into the suggested meanings in poetry, the function and goal of poetic language which distinguishes literature from scripture, *śāstra*, and so on.

S. K. De finds it virtually impossible that the idea of the soul of poetry has not been implied even in the poetry of the *Ṛg Veda*, and he writes a lengthy footnote to support this point,

152 For example, see verse 23 of Bhartṛhari's *Vairāgyaśataka.* "*tvaṃ rājā vayam apy upāsitagurupraj̃ñābhimānonnatāḥ/ khyātas tvaṃ vibhavair yaśāṃsi kavayo dikṣu pratanvanti naḥ/ itthaṃ mānada nātidūram ubhayor apy āvayor antaram/ yady asmāsu parāṅmukho 'si vayam apy ekāntato niḥpṛhāḥ.*" "You are a king, we also are elevated by the pride of wisdom from the teachers we have served. You are known by your powers, we poets extend our fame in all directions. Thus, the gap between us two is not so great, O pride-destroyer. If you turn away from us, we are also absolutely indifferent." (my translation) Bhartṛhari, *Vairāgyaśatakam,* in *Śatakatrayam,* with the gloss of Mahābalopāhvakṛṣṇaśāstri (2d ed., Bombay: Nirnayasagar Press, 1891), p. 11.

See also Stein, tr., *RT* 1.3-5, p. 2; 1.46-7, p. 10. 1.46 "We pay reverence to that naturally sublime craft of poets without whose favour even mighty kings are not remembered, though the earth, encircled by the oceans, was sheltered under the shadow of their arms as in the shade of forest trees." 1.47. "Without thee, O brother composer of true poetry, this world does not even in its dream know of the existence of those ornaments of the earth who once rested their feet on the temples of elephants, who possessed wealth, and in whose palaces maidens dwelt, moons of the day,--without thee the universe is blind, why [praise thee] with a hundred hymns.?"

153 Vāmana, *The Kāvyālaṃkārasūtras of Vāmana* (*KA*), with his own *Vṛtti,* Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab,ed., Kāvyamālā 15 (Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, 1889) 1.2.6, p. 3.

> The metaphorical expression *kāvyaśarīra* with its implied *kāvyātman* plays an important part in Sanskrit Poetics throughout its history.... Whatever may be the value of this metaphor as an index to the conception of poetry gradually evolved by Indian theorists, one point is clear, viz., that they all take, from Bhāmaha to Jagannātha, the *śabda* and *artha* as constituting what they call the 'body' of poetry; and with this idea the theories start, ultimately ending in a search for its 'soul'.[154]

De again writes,

> The older writers on Poetics, therefore, before the advent of the Dhvani-theorists, content themselves with the working out of the outward form of expression, the 'body' of poetry, and hardly trouble themselves with the question of an ulterior aesthetic principle, the 'soul of poetry; nor do they identify, as some later writers do, this 'soul' with the psychological factor known as Rasa.[155]

The perception of this modern literary critic is precisely that the talk of 'soul' and 'body' implies an 'ulterior aesthetic principle' which animates the outward form of expression. Gerow, on the other hand, minimizes this distinction as a metaphorical usage that can easily be overloaded, proposing that the force of '*śarīra*' is that of a 'corpus' of literature. He further alludes to the imagination, which is "the quality of the poetic product corresponding to the faculty of imagination and [which] is considered to be the proof of genius,"[156] as the prime characteristic in the Western stereotype of a poet; and this quality, in Gerow's opinion, has been supplanted by its opposites in

---

154 De, *HSP*, vol. 2, p. 35-6.

155 De, *HSP*, vol. 2, pp. 116-7. See also De, *HSP*, p. 90.

156 Edwin Gerow, *A Glossary of Indian Figures of Speech* (*Glossary*)(The Hague: Mouton, 1971), p. 68.

classical India.[157]

Ānandavardhana in his treatment of *pratibhā* in the fourth *uddyota* of the *Dhvanyāloka,* in fact directly addresses the problem of imitation and creative distinctiveness: the *rasika* poet who possesses *pratibhā* and exploits the suggestive function of poetic language will be able to create fresh and original poetry even on age-old themes. Gerow, however, takes imagination to be the figure of speech *bhāvika* which is "the ability to make the several images of the individual poetic statement coherent in terms demanded by the work as a larger whole."[158] In sum, he writes on the absence of a universal aesthetic in Indian thoughts on the arts:

> The notion of such a universal or analogical aesthetic did not suggest itself to Indian thinkers, as it has to our own since the Renaissance, because the creative act had always been considered a matter of technique and style embodied in a tradition, evolving from its own material, and not a manifestation of the freely intuiting intellect, the genius.[159]

This statement is an accurate description even of Ānanda who thinks of the poet's imagination, endless when combined with the suggestive function of language, as a gift of the goddess Sarasvatī and an extension of the

157 Gerow, *Glossary,* p. 60.

158 Gerow, *Glossary,* p. 68.

159 Gerow, *Glossary,* p. 81. The image of the "poet" or the "artist," as Gerow rightly observes, influences the manner of appreciating poetry. In the postmodern phase of Western literary criticism, after critics have pronounced the death of the author, the critics and readers take equal shares in controlling the meanings of poetry. Nevertheless, critics and readers still take an interest in biographical notes of poets and how these personal experiences influence their dominant themes and images.

capacity of language, rather than a unique possession of individual poets. But given that individual geniuses proceed from material and technique rather than manipulate them, Indian poeticians constantly take *pratibhā* as a quality that excites and thrills the poet for its inspirational and inexplicable resource to produce the cutting edge of poetry.

The absence of a stereotype of individualism does not prohibit the striving toward particularly unique excellences within well-defined rules of tradition. The cultivation of various tropes and regional styles, and even of emotional and psychological nuances of *rasa* s and *bhāva* s, is a gift of the Indian poetic imagination, whose stereotype is inevitably different from that of the West. The notion that poetic excellences are an extension of the poet as an individual, rather than of his technique and material, can also be found in Kuntaka's treatment of *pratibhā*: the poet's unique talents are differentiated into particulars of imagination expressed as distinct types of poetic excellences.[160]

When modern Indian critics seek to explain the causal connection between the poet and his creation through the imagination, they look to the notion of *pratibhā* rather than *bhāvika* as the poet's imagination. The uses of these two allied terms surely intimate that Indian poeticians conceive of literary works in terms of their distinctiveness, a unique and created coherence which can be controlled by nothing else but an imagination purely of a poetic kind. The reason that *bhāvika* should be an *arthālaṃkāra* is not

---

[160] Kuntaka, *Vakroktijīvita*, Critically edited with variants, introduction and English translation by K. Krishnamoorthy (Dharwad: Karnatak University), 1977, 1.24-29, pp. 40-48. See translation, pp. 326-334. According to Kuntaka, styles, *mārga*, are extensions of the individual poets' *pratibhā*s which in turn arise from his nature and temperament.

readily obvious, unless figures of speech are thought of as poetic devices that can operate not only in words and phrases, but throughout an entire piece.

If the notion of *pratibhā* or *bhāvika* brings into play the poet's individual creative talent which accounts for particular beauty and excellences of literary works, then this notion necessarily involves the kind of beauty that poetry is thought to possess. The question of 'soul' and 'body' must then be reconsidered as the aesthetician's attempt to categorize the elements that are possibly beautiful, and whose beauty is produced by the poet and appreciated by the reader. Thus, between De's position that Indian poetry and poetics must have always been alive to an emotive quality of poetry as an 'ulterior aesthetic principle,' implied in the term *kāvyaśarīra,* and Gerow's attitude of neutrality to these categories, there is a third position, namely, that such a categorization is heuristically and thus metaphorically useful for orienting the aesthetic attitude, of the poet and the reader to literary works. There is no reason against taking the texts at their face values: when Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha speak of the body of poetry, the metaphor can be take straightforwardly as described for the sake of depicting a whole whose analytical parts can be individually investigated. Similarly, Ānanda speaks of the 'soul' of poetry exactly to distinguish the whole from its parts, as well as to reorient the aesthetic attitude of literary-minded readers toward perceiving through the relations of the whole and parts the beauty of poetry.

Indian aestheticians today take the concept of *pratibhā* to be the factor that relates the poet's imagination to literature. T. N. Sreekantaiya, with reference to Coleridge's and John Dewey's descriptions of imagination, says

on imagination,

> There is a whole gamut of allied senses in which the word is used, from the simplest which is little more than the power of vivid visualization to the highest, the activity of the whole mind of a poet in which conceptions swarm into the stream of consciousness and are integrated into a beautiful whole.[161]

K. Kunjunni Raja traces the Indian meaning of poetic imagination to the great artists of the *Ṛg Veda* :

> ... the Ṛgveda itself contains clear statements about the process of the creation and appreciation of poetry; about the importance of the poetic vision, the great care needed in communicating the art experience and the role of the responsive listener in the aesthetic experience.[162]

The eminent Indian grammarian and aesthetician continues,

> ... as the primary source of poetic inspiration and as the cause of poetry... This *pratibhā* or poetic vision is an instantaneous or time-less flash of insight integral, indivisible and immediate, and accompanied by a sense of happiness and joy,....[163]

According to his view, Indian aesthetics contributes the notion that poetry comprises a 'circuit of the artist's experience,' involving

(1) the artist's experience, (2) the communication through the artistic

---

[161] T. N. Sreekantaiya, " 'Imagination' in Indian Poetics," *Indian Historical Quarterly,* vol. 13, no. 1 (March, 1937): 59-84, p. 60.

[162] K. Kunjunni Raja, *The Language of Poetry,* Extension Lectures Publication Series: 29, Dharwad: Karnatak University, 1978, p. 2.

[163] K. Kunjunni Raja, *The Language of Poetry,* p. 8.

medium, and (3) the reception and recreation of the artist's experience by the receptive art connoisseur." A communication of an aesthetic experience is successful when what is felt by the artist is similarly felt in the audience with equal intensity, clarity, and delight.[164]

Although Ānandavardhana is the first critic to articulate the role of the *sahṛdaya,* the sensitive reader, which fullfills the above-described circuit of aesthetic experience, poets and critics before him are mindful in varying degrees of the reader. The nature of poetic communication of which poetic texts explicitly speak or hint at is to be described below.

Poetic Communication

While Vedic poets are conscious of themselves as 'seers' whose visions bring about an interaction between the gods and humans,[165] and are subsequently thought of as the seers of reality,[166] the role of poets in the classical and medieval period has become secular. The reward of writing poetry, poetics texts tell us, is untold wealth and undying fame. Poets thrive

---

164 K. Kunjunni Rāja, *The Language of Poetry*, p. 2.

165 See ch. 2, "*Dhī* in the Ṛgveda," in *Jan Gonda, The Vision of the Vedic Poets* (1st Indian edition Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd, 1984 [1st published as vol. 8 in Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae, 1963]), pp. 68-169.

166 See Yāska, *Nirukta,* 1.18-20. On the intuitive insight of the seers, describes seeing as understanding the real meanings of words. To see truly means to understanding the real purport and to be able to use it for successful communications with humans and the gods. Bhartṛhari cites the same passage when speaking of how Brahman, the One, becomes Its *anukāra,* the *Veda,* when seen by the seers who describe It to others in language, the form of diversity. Yāska, *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta: The Oldest Indian Treatise on Etymology, Philology, and Semantics,* Laksman Sarup., ed. and tr., (Repr.Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967, 1984 [1st ed. 1920-1927]), pp. 18-20. The *vṛtti* of *VP* 1.5 especially draws extensively on these verses of the *Nirukta* which have been copiously referred to in the *Mahābhāṣya* 1.1.

in cities and find their audience in the courtly circles and wealthy upper classes.

Siegfried Lienhard describes a typical literary milieu in which the art and craft of the poet is assiduously cultivated in his education and through competitions in courtly assemblies or societies (*goṣṭhī*) where literary minds meet to sharpen their wits. The audience, also highly cultured and similarly educated, do not look for a personal expression of the poet's own experiences but rather for his skillful presentation of well-known themes. A poem is likened to a miniature painting whose motifs and imageries need to be deciphered by the viewer.[167] The sensitive reader is familiar with its theme and ornamentations, and he is emotionally primed to be receptive to such familiar conventions. He expects novelty in an individual poet's presentation rather than in sentiments:

> Just as the poet's inspiration is shown mainly in the presentation, often in the details and refinements of a few lines, so the connoisseur's attitude to the poem is characterized by the fact that it is not the subject matter or the theme as such that primarily arouses his interest and gives him the pleasure of discovering something new, but the manner of presentation--the "how" rather than the "what". For the reader, the individuality and unique quality of any work resides in the way in which the poet has handled the traditional, predetermined elements which belong to *kāvya*.[168]

This seems to represent closely a reader response that leads to the

---

[167] Siegfried Lienhard, *A History of Classical Poetry: Sanskrit-Pali-Prakrit* (*HCP*) in *A History of Indian Literature* (*HIL*), Vol. 2, Fasc. 1, Jan Gonda, general ed. (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz) 1984, p. 37

[168] Lienhard, *HCP*, p.32.

popularity of *citrakāvya*, 'portrait' poetry. Ānanda, considering it an inferior product or even a non-poetry, cautions his readers against such 'miniature' poems in which *rasa* or any other kind of emotion figures but little,

> That which is different from these, namely poetry which lacks *rasa* or an emotion (*bhāva*) as its final meaning, which lacks the power to reveal any particular suggested meaning, which is composed only by relying on novelties of literal sense and expression, and which gives the appearance of a picture, is *citra*. It is not real poetry [just as a picture is not the real thing] for it is an imitation of poetry. ... But where there is no reference to the *rasas*, etc., there cannot be any type of poetry at all. Because poetry cannot be about nothing.[169]

Lienhard further describes such conventional novelty: it does not suffer the intrusion of a poet's feelings. Rather, the reader or listener discovers the special qualities that a poem (and its author) wishes to emphasize by paying close attention to the handling of details. Such a reader is described by Lienhard:

> He recognizes them, as already stated, by the fine variations from the norm, by new combinations of the fixed poetic material specified for certain descriptions, themes and attributes. He also recognizes them by the way in which figures (*alaṃkāra*) are constructed, the manner in which information is presented in each sentence or stanza and by the suitability (*aucitya*) of both sound and sense-bearing elements.[170]

Conceptions of "body" and "soul"

Early conceptions of poetry as a body express the pride of poets: the

---

169 Ingalls et al, tr., *DhĀ, vṛtti*, 3.41-2, p. 636.

170 Lienhard, *HCP*, p.35

kāvyavapuḥ or *kāvyaśarīra* is the immortal body that lives as fresh and beautifully as ever after the poet himself has perished,[171] and which immortalizes the deeds of kings.[172] That which holds this body together and gives coherence to a literary piece is the poet's intention, *bhāva*, which is analysed as a quality or a figure of speech called *bhāvika* variously described by critics.

Broadly speaking, Daṇḍin considers the body of poetry, an arrangement of words with a poet's intended meanings, to be adorned by ornaments which are figures of speech.[173] He seeks for the cause of beauty (*cārutvahetu*) in the body distinguished by natural regional styles, primarily the *gauḍīya* and *vaidarbha*,[174] and by the poet's own distinctive style, which together are called *mārga*. Figures of speech are ornamentation which adorns the body and increases its beauty; such ornamentation consists in artful manipulation of meanings within the arrangement of style (*mārga*). The life of this well-adorned body is given and sustained by the poet's *bhāva*. On the body of poetry, Daṇḍin writes,

1.10 Wise men have shown that poems have a body and ornaments,

171 Bhāmaha, *KA* 1.6-7 "*upeyuṣām api divaṃ san nibandhavidhāyinām / āsta eva nirātaṅka kāntaṃ kāvyamayaṃ vapuḥ // ruṇaddhi rodasī cāsya yāvat kīrtir anaśvarī / tāvat kilāyam adhyāste sukṛto vaibuddhaṃ padam//*"

172 Daṇḍin, *KĀ* 1.3-5 "*iha śiṣṭānuśiṣṭānāṃ śiṣṭānām api sarvathā/ vācām eva prasādena lokayātrā pravartate// idam andhaṃ tamaḥ kṛtsnaṃ jāyeta bhuvanatrayam/ yadi śabdāhvayaṃ jyotir āsaṃsāraṃ na dīpyate// ādirājayaśobimbam ādarśaṃ prāpya vāṅmayam/ teṣāṃ asaṃnidhāne 'pi na svayaṃ paśya naśyati//*"

173 Daṇḍin, *KĀ* 1.10-18, 2.1-3ff.

174 The *rīti*s are subsequently said by Vāmana to be the soul of poetry. See, on *mārga*, *rīti* in Daṇḍin and later critics, particularly Vāmana, D. K. Gupta, *A Critical Study of Daṇḍin and His Works* (Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas, 1970) pp. 121-145.

The body, to begin with, is an arrangement of words distinguished by a desired meaning.

2.364 They call *bhāvika* the quality that governs a large composition, The poet's emotion (*bhāva*) is the intention that figures in poems up to their completion.

2.365 Mutual compatibility of all parts of the subject matter, a lack of meaningless particulars, description of places,

2.366 a clarity even of obscure (*gambhīra*) themes : since all these things are controlled by *bhāva,* they call it *bhāvika.*[175]

Bhāmaha rejects the basic divisions of Daṇḍin, namely, the concrete distinctions between regional styles (*KĀ* 1.31-36) and the notion that an arrangement of words can be analysed separately from their meanings in figurative usages (*KĀ* 1.13-16). He states that sound and sense of words together are the body and ornaments of poetry,

Poetry consists of word and meaning together. It is twofold, namely,

[175] Otto Böhtlingkt, tr., *Daṇḍin Poetik* Leipzig: Verlag von H. Haessel, 1890) p.2, p.84. (My translations)

1.10 *taiḥ (sūribhiḥ) śarīraṃ ca kāvyānām alaṃkārāś ca darśitāḥ*
śarīraṃ tāvad iṣṭārthavyavacchinnā padāvalī

2.364 *tadbhāvikam iti prāhuḥ prabandhaviṣayaṃ guṇam*
bhāvaḥ kaver abhiprāyaḥ kāvyeṣv āsiddhi saṃsthitaḥ

2.365 *parasparopakāritvaṃ sarveṣāṃ vastuparvaṇām*
viśeṣaṇānāṃ vyarthānām akriyā sthānavarṇanā

2.366 *vyaktir uktikramabalād gambhīrasyāpi vastunaḥ*
bhāvāyattam idaṃ sarvam iti tad bhāvikaṃ viduḥ

> prose and verse. Otherwise, it is threefold, namely Sanskrit, Prākrit, and apabhraṃśa.[176]

but accepts the distinction of *śabdālaṃkāra* and *arthālaṃkāra*.[177] The body of poetry is described by the verses,

> 1.6 Truly, the faultless and lovely body made of poetry remains
> of those who create literary works, though they have gone to heaven.
>
> 1.7 So long as his imperishable fame obstructs the earth and sky,
> indeed, he stands above blessed in the realm of the gods.
>
> 1.8 Thus he who desires glory whose boundaries are the expanse of the
> earth, who knows what ought to be known, should strive toward
> the beauty of poetry,[178]

as that which is faultless and lovely. It is the imperishable body of poetry that gives the poet his eternal fame and a place among the gods. The idea that poetry is the light of the ages, glorifying the deeds of kings and the poets, and this body of beauty ought to be faultless, is similarly expressed by

---

176 P. V. Naganatha Sastry, *Kāvyālaṃkāra of Bhāmaha* (*KA*), (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2nd ed., 1970), 1.16, p. 6, "*śabdārthau sahitau kāvyaṃ gadyaṃ padyaṃ ca tad dvidhā saṃskṛtaṃ prākṛtam cānyad apabhraṃśa iti tridhā.*"

177 Bhāmaha, *KA* 1.15, p. 6.

178 Bhāmaha, *KA* 1.6-8, pp. 2-3.

upeyuṣām api divaṃ sannibandhavidhāyinām
āsta eva nirātaṅkaṃ kāntaṃ kāvyamayaṃ vapuḥ

ruṇaddhi rodasī cāsya yāvat kīrtir anaśvarī
tāvat kilāyam adhyāste sukṛtī vaibudhaṃ padam.

ato 'bhivāñchatā kīrtiṃ stheyasīmā bhuvaḥ sthiteḥ
yatno viditavedyena vidheyaḥ kāvyalakṣmaṇi.

Daṇḍin,

> 1.4 All these three worlds would become blind darkness
> if the light called "words" does not illuminate all through *saṃsāra*.
>
> 1.5 The reflection of the first kings' glory, after it reaches the mirror of eloquence [and] sees itself, does not perish, although the [kings] are no longer present.
>
> 1.7 Therefore, even a small fault in a poem should in no way be overlooked; even a beautiful body is unsightly because of a single leprous spot.[179]

For both early poeticians, once the 'body' of poetry has been circumscribed, categorizations can be made in respect of genres, kinds of ornamentation that increase and defects that mar the beauty of that body. Elements of aesthetic criteria at this stage of development entail the sounds and sense, but emotive aspects of poetry are confined to the types of figures known as *rasavad*, etc. The *rasa* s themselves are stated by Bhāmaha (*KA* 1.21) and Daṇḍin (*KĀ* 1.18) to be requisite in *mahākāvya* s because such lengthy works necessarily describe the vicissitudes of human lives.

Although both critics ascribe the source of the poet's creative genius to

---

[179] Dandin, *KĀ* 1.4, 5, 7, pp. 1-2.

idam andhaṃ tamaḥ kṛtsnaṃ jāyeta bhuvanatrayam
yadi śabdāhvayaṃ jyotir āsaṃsāraṃ na dīpyate.

ādirājayaśobimbam ādarśaṃ prāpya vāṅmayam
teṣām asaṃnidhāne 'pi na svayaṃ paśya naśyati.

tad alpam api nopekṣyaṃ kāvye duṣṭaṃ kathaṃ cana
syād vapuḥ sundaram api śvitreṇaikena durbhagam.

pratibhā, as Lienhard observes, the poet's feelings are not deemed essential to the beauty of the poems. Their active agency is alluded to as *bhāvika,* a quality (*guṇa*) which is the poet's *bhāva* in the sense of intention, *abhiprāya.* For Daṇḍin, this quality governs an overall coherence, particularly of a larger piece such as a *prabandha,* through a proper composition and juxtaposition of the parts in the whole work.[180]

Bhāmaha tersely mentions the poet's role in a similar manner, through the quality of *bhāvikatva*, using the same phrase as Daṇḍin's: *bhāvikatvam iti prāhuḥ prabandhaviṣayaṃ guṇam*. The cause of this quality is the coherence the story and orderliness of language that makes poetic themes vivid as if directly perceived.[181] Gerow rightly calls this figure of speech 'imagination,' since it acknowledges that the cause of the excellence of poetry, apart from objectively analysable literary devices, is the compositional and subjective arrangement on the part of the poet, not included in the 'body' of poetry.[182] The prescription of a poet's own emotions, such as a *bhāva* or *rasa,* as a vital element in a composition does not yet occur to poeticians of this period because the poet's role is not to communicate feelings, but rather to create a beautiful body of such descriptions. Although the notion of *rasa* exists in the works of the earliest critics--Bharata, Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha--it is clearly and elaborately described only by Bharata in connection with drama and the theater. For in this context, a *rasa* is the very end-product that dramatists wish to produce in the audience by means of poetic language, the theatrical accoutrements of

---

180 Daṇḍin, *KĀ* 2.363-6, p. 84. See p. 108 above, and n. 175.

181 Bhāmaha, *KA* 3.53-4, p. 71.

182 See also D. K. Gupta, "Concept of Bhāvika in Sanskrit Poetics," *ABORI* : 54-60, and V, Raghavan, "The History of Bhāvika in Sanskrit Poetics, *IHQ* 14, (1938): 787-798.

costumes and music, the actors' acting, singing, dancing, and so on. For early literary critics, concerned chiefly or solely with poetry, consider the *rasa* s as emotions that are required only in larger works.

The progress in Indian aesthetics from Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha to Ānandavardhana is great, but the latter's achievement must be seen to follow from earlier concepts in general and his predecessors in Kashmir in particular. Udbhaṭa and Vāmana, who are known to be attached to the court of Jayāpīḍa,[183] appear to represent the 'schools' of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin respectively.

Vāmana, the first to speak of the soul of poetry, describes the body as word and meanings together, refined by qualities and ornaments.[184] *Rīti*, the three-fold style --*vaidarbhī, gauḍīyā and pāñcālī*-- is the soul because it is that which gives a poem its distinctive quality or character.[185] This distinctiveness is the substance of qualities *guṇa* s,[186] which are strength, clarity, and so on.[187] Ornaments are causes of superexcellence of poetry.[188] Relations between the body and ornaments are metaphorically dscribed in this verse:

> A poem, indeed, is sweet (*svadate*) like the form of a young woman, exceedingly purified even by qualities,

---

[183] See n. 151 above.

[184] Vāmana, *KA* 3.1.2 (See ns. 40,41 below), and 1.1.1 *vṛtti*, p. 1. "*kāvyam khalu grāhyam... śabdārthayor vartate.*"

[185] Vāmana, *KA* 1.2.6-9 and *vṛtti*, p. 6.

[186] Vāmana, *KA* 3.1.1, p. 25.

[187] Vāmana, *KA* 3.1-4., p. 26. See a listing of the *guṇa*s in De, *HSP*, vol. 2, pp. 80, 94-95, and pp. 75-107 on "Daṇḍin and Vāmana."

[188] Vāmana, *KA* 3.1.2, p. 25.

in which pleasure is created by dense creations of artifices that are
true ornaments.
But if it happens that, like the body that fails in vigor because of its
qualities, a woman is bereft of youth,
Even those ornaments people love surely rest on
unwholesomeness.[189]

Structurally conceived, the body and soul are considered together apart from the character and ornamentation. The body is simply the word-and-meaning of poetry, and the soul is its distinctive arrangement according to established regional styles. Qualities and ornaments are imposed on the body, and the verse above tells us that the body must first have a wholesome and youthful character; otherwise, ornaments, far from adorning it, would lose their own beauty, like ornaments on an old woman.

We recall Ānandavardhana's important metaphor comparing the body and soul of a beautiful woman to those of poetry in *Dhā* 1.4:

The substance (*vastu*) is something else still which is felt in the poems of great poets,
that which appears different from the well-known parts, like charm in beautiful women.

Still something else, being perceived from the literal meaning, is the substance in the poems of great poets. Well-known to the sensitive audience, it is that which shines out apart from obvious, ornamented or

---

189 Vāmana, *KĀ* 3.1.2, p. 25.
yuvater iva rūpam aṅga kāvyaṃ svadate śuddhaguṇaṃ tad apy atīva
vihitapraṇayaṃ nirantarābhiḥ sadalaṃkāravikalpakakalpanābhiḥ.
yadi bhavati vacaś cyutaṃ guṇebhyo vapur iva yauvanavandhyam aṅganāyāḥ
api janadayitāni durbhagatvaṃ niyatam alaṃkaraṇāni saṃśrayante.

> perceived, limbs, like charm in beautiful women. For just as in women, charm is other than each and every part being individually described but rather something else, another essence which is nectar in the eyes of the sensitive audience, just so is this [suggested] meaning.[190]

For Vāmana, the soul and body are an indistinguishable entity, and character and ornaments are extrinsic. Ānanda uses the same imagery in quite an opposite way: the soul is likened to the charm of a beautiful woman shining out as nectar to the eyes of a *sahṛdaya* above the beauty of her limbs. Although the parts are each well known and well described separately, the whole is felt to be something altogether beyond them. This soul is the suggested meaning, other than the literal meaning which is the well-known and adorned parts of the body.

Udbhaṭa's contributions to the theory of *rasadhvani* and the soul of poetry are many, in spite of the paucity of his extant works and the unreliability of their commentaries. Gnoli credits him with the introduction of a third potency of poetic language, the *vyañjanāvṛtti*.[191] Ingalls describes

---

190 Ānandavardhana, *Dhvanyāloka*, with the *Locana* commentary of Abhinavagupta and the *Prakāśa* Hindi translation of both texts by Jagannath Paṭhak, Vidyābhavan Sanskrit Granthamala (VSS) 97 (Benares Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, 1965), 1.4, p. 47.

191 Raniero Gnoli, *Udbhaṭa's Commentary on the Kāvyālaṃkāra of Bhāmaha*. Serie Orientale Roma, vol. 27 (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1962), "Udbhaṭa by introducing into poetry the secondary function of words... let open the door to the conception of a third potency of language--the *vyañjanāvṛtti*--, different both from the primary and the transferred sense of words, which characteries true poetry." (p. xxiii-iv). "The source of poetry must be then another sense or value that words assume, altogether different from the primary and the secondary one. This new sense--the poetical sense--irreducible, as it is, to the literary one, cannot however do without it, but is, as it were, supported by it. A truly poetical word or expression is that which

Udbhaṭa's influence on the *Dhvanyāloka* as his awareness of explicit and implicit meanings, as those which are conveyed *śrutyā* and *arthena* respectively. Thus, according to Ingalls, Indurāja's concluding remark that Udbhaṭa has nothing to say on *dhvani* because Udbhaṭa has included that in his treatment of the figures of speech, is justified because

> Udbhaṭa was fully aware of that type of semantic operation that Ānanda was later to call suggestiveness (*vyañjakatva, dhvani*) and of the importance to poetry of the suggestions which it could bring about. One might fairly say that in Udbhaṭa's mind the two main building blocks of Ānanda's critique, *rasa* and *dhvani*, were present, the first consciously, the second perhaps only subconsciously. But the blocks had not yet been built into a system.[192]

Udbhaṭa's *Kāvyālaṃkārasārasaṃgraha* displays more than a casual acquaintance with Bharata's definitions of and relations between the *bhāva* s and *rasa* s.[193] To Ingalls' remark that Udbhaṭa's treatment of the figures *preyasvī, urjasvī, rasavat,* etc., makes some sensible order out of them, it

---

cannot be replaced by other words without losing its value. Poetry knows no synonyms. The father of this new conception, Ānandavardhana, was fully aware of his indebtedness to Udbhaṭa." (p. xxv-vi.)

192 Daniel H. H. Ingalls, Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson, and M. V. Patwardhan, trs., *The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandvardhana with the Locana of Abhinavagupta* (*Dhā*, Ingalls et. al., tr.), edited with introduction by Daniel H. H. Ingalls, Harvard Oriental Series 49. (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press), 1990, introduction, p. 9.

193 Udbhaṭa, *Kāvyālaṃkārasārasaṃgraha of Udbhaṭa* (*KASS*, Banhatti, ed.), with the *Laghuvṛtti* Commentary of Indurāja, edited, introduced and annotated by Narayana Daso Banhatti, (Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 79. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1925), 4.1-7, pp. 40-53. See also, Udbhaṭa, *Kāvyālaṅkārasāra-saṅgraha of Udbhaṭa* (*KASS*)), with the ' *Vivṛti* ' Critically edited with introduction and indexes by K.S. Ramaswami Sastri Siromani. Gaekwad Oriental Series 55 (Baroda: Oriental Instituted), 1931, 4.1-7, pp. 32-34.

may be added that perhaps these very verses which intimate the suggestions of *rasa* first provoked Ānanda's thoughts to the theory of *rasadhvani.* Finally, if the commentators, Pratīhārendurāja and Tilaka, are faithful to the true teachings of the text, Udbhaṭa can be credited with the idea that *rasa* is the soul of poetry,[194] and that *rasa* is suggested or

---

194 Udbhaṭa, *KASS* with the *laghuvṛtti,* 6.7 (74), Banhatti, ed., p. 81-84. In this verse Pratīhārendurāja seems to have combined Vāmana's idea of the soul of poetry with the notion that poetry is *sarasa,* and expounds at great length to this effect, "*ucyate. na khalu kāvyasya rasānāṃ cālaṃkāryālaṃkārabhāvaḥ kiṃ tv ātmaśarīrabhāvaḥ. rasāḥ hi kāvyasyātmatvenāvasthitāḥ śabdārthau ca śarīrarūpatayā. yathā hy ātmādhiṣṭhitaṃ śarīraṃ jīvatīti vyapadiśyate tathā rasādhiṣṭhitasya kāvyasya jīvadrūpatayā vyapadeśaḥ kriyate tasmād rasānāṃ kāvyaśarīrabhūtaśabdārtha-viṣayatayātmatvenāvasthānaṃ na tv alaṃkāratayā.*" (p. 63) But the commentor explicates the meaning of the verse without saying the comments are indeed Udbhaṭa's intended ideas on the matter. Banhatti, the editor, and De do not think the comment highly representative of the text, but Pratīhārendurāja seems to be in an era which the literary circles have accepted '*rasa ātmā kāvyasya*' but not *dhvani.* The former proposition, whose terms are already well known in poetics and dramaturgy and are readily associable, is much easier to accept that *dhvani,* which is brought in from the grammarians' point of view and describes an entity that no one up to then has thought to exist in poetic language. Pratīhārendurāja's commentary cited above substantiates my point that the conceptions of 'soul' and 'body' are structural and not neutral categories. Pratīhārendurāja does not accept Ānanda's theory of *dhvani* since it is seen that the former tries to show that a figure of speech rather than a meaning is suggested, i.e., revealed (*vyajyate*), and, therefore, suggestion is not a function of language but a figure of speech. He seems to follow the basic divisions of body, quality, and ornament of poetry as prescribed by Vāmana, and ends by saying, "*evam etad vyañjakatvaṃ paryāyoktādiṣvādiṣv antarbhāvitam.*" "Thus this suggestiveness is included in the figures of speech, *paryāyokta,* and so on." (p. 92) His arguments against *dhvani* can be found in *Laghuvṛtti* 6.9, p. 85ff (Banhatti, ed.) Banhatti also notes on that, "His principal object in the foregoing discussion was to prove that *vyañjakatva* is completely included in the alaṃkāras. He seems to have a great aversion to the theory that *dhvani* is quite separate and can never be included in alaṃkāras. Further he seems also to have an abhorrence even for the word *dhvani....*" (p. 175)

revealed, *vyaṅgya*.[195] His thought, obscured by time, is obfuscated rather than elucidated by the commentaries. Both Pratīhārendurāja and Tilaka, if indeed they are the authors of these commentaries, seem to have little direct knowledge of and traditional connection with the author, and their comments appear to be a conglomeration of several ideas that originated between the late 10th and 11th centuries. The commentaries, whose explications include those meanings that arose subsequent to Udbhaṭa, and are valuable for understanding, if not the author of the text, the evolution of poetics during the next few centuries. Yet it is more than tempting to see in Pratīhārendurāja's and Tilaka's commentaries on Udbhaṭa's *bhāvika* the pronouncement of a relation between the poet and the reader that culminates in Ānandavardhana's *sahṛdayatvam.* A verse of Udbhaṭa's (*KASS* 6.6) fairly recapitulates Bhāmaha's (*KA* 3.53), to which Pratīhārendurāja comments:

> This has been said: "**Through a coherence of utterances, [there are] extreme marvels.**" In this case, a coherence of utterances causes an instantaneous perception of the meaning because a composition of words are well-known tc people and are devoid of incoherence (*vyastasaṃbandha*). For, when there is [coherence], the feeling (*bhāva*) that is linked to the poet--his heart (*āśaya*)-- devises particular

[195] Udbhaṭa, *KASS* 4.2, Siromani ed., GOS 55, p. 32. The verse: "*ratyādikānāṃ bhāvānām anubhāvādisūcane/ yat kāvyaṃ badhyate sadbhis tatpreyasvad udāhṛtam.*" Tilaka's commentary interprets '*sūcane*" to mean *vyaktau*: "*sthāyibhāvatvāt rates tu vyabhicāribhir api sūcane vyaktau yat kāvyabandhanaṃ (tat) preyasvat. ratyā priyatarayā upalakṣitaṃ bhāvabṛndam atrāstīti. ata eva vyaṅgyā rasabhāvatadābhāsa-tatpraśamāḥ kāvyatattvavidbhir abhidhīyate.*" Tilaka's commentary is not a reliable report of Udbhaṭa's text because Tilaka seems to have incorporated some ideas of Abhinavagupta and Bhaṭṭanāyaka, such as the phrases "*vahneḥ śītanivṛttir anumīyata iti kāraṇasyāpi kvacit gamakatvāt vibhāvair bhavaty eva sūcanam*" and "*api tu sādhāraṇyena pratipanno rasanāvyāpāragocaraḥ.*"

> meanings that are means to the four aims of humans and are possessed of the *rasa* of love and so on. This [design] is made immediately perceptible to the sympathetic hearers as if [they were] the poet, as an image reflected by various poems because [the poet's feeling] is not different from [the hearers'] own design. In this situation, the counter impression (*pratimudrā*) of the sympathetic hearers' own design goes along, because their innerself is caused to melt by experiencing clear words of this sort. Thus, the design of the poet, consisting of present and past things he has experienced, is perceived as if right before the eyes by the sympathetic hearer to be the same as his own design.... So, therefore, *bhāvika* should be seen to consist in the meeting of the two designs of the poet and the hearer on the basis of this kind of cause. And for this very reason, a *bhāva*, linked with the poet [and] ending in an identity, etc., with the hearer's *bhāva* is termed *bhāvika,* because it exists in a form that is vibrant before [one's eyes].[196]

Tilaka's commentary alludes to a similar poet-reader relation but denies that the reader, under the effect of this figure of speech, is a *sahṛdaya*:

> Events (*bhāva*), even in violation of destructive and prior absences [i.e.

[196] Udbhaṭa, *KASS* 6.6 (73), Banhatti ed., p. 79-80. "*tad uktam vācām anākulyeneti atyadbhutā iti ca. tatra vācām anākulatā vyastasambandharahita-lokaprasiddhaśabdopanibandhāt jhagity arthapratītikāritā. tasyāṃ hi satyāṃ kaveḥ sambandhī yo bhāva āśayaḥ śṛṅgārādirasasaṃvalitacaturvargopāyabhūtaviśiṣṭārtho-llekhī sa kavineva sahṛdayaiḥ śrotṛbhiḥ svābhiprāyābhedena tattatkāvyapratibimbita-rūpatayā sākṣātkriyate. śrotṝṇām api hi tathāvidhasvacchaśabdānubhavadrāvitāntar-ātmanā sahṛdayānāṃ svābhiprāyapratimudrā tatra saṃkrāmati. ataḥ kaver yo 'sau abhiprāyas tadgocarīkṛtā bhūtā bhāvino 'pi padārthās tatra sahṛdayaiḥ śrotṛbhiḥ svābhiprāyābhedena pratyakṣā iva dṛśyante...tad evam evaṃvidhahetunibandhanaṃ kaviśrotṛbhāvadvitayasammīlanātmakaṃ bhāvikaṃ draṣṭavyam. ata eva cātra kavisambandhino bhāvasya śrotṛbhāvābhedādyavasitasya puraḥsphuradrūpasya vidyamānatvād bhāvikavyapadeśaḥ....*" Compare Bhāmaha's *KA* 3.53, "*bhāvikatvam iti prāhuḥ prabandhaviṣayaṃ guṇam/ pratyakṣā iva dṛśyante yatrārthā bhūtabhāvinaḥ,*" with Udbhaṭa's *KASS* 6.6, "*pratiyakṣā iva yatrārthā dṛśyante bhūtabhāvinaḥ/ atyadbhutāḥ syāt tad vācām anākulyena bhāvikam.*"

> events in the past and future], when by their own importance and the power of the clarity of Speech, are composed so to appear as a flashing series, that will be *bhāvika.* The heart (*āśaya*) of the speaker is in the hearer in this situation.... In the explanation that it is the ability to enter into the [sympathetic] heart, it will be a figure of speech, such as *rasavat* and so on.[197]

These passages from Udbhaṭa's verses, and their commentaries, indicate that the role of *rasa* has already begun to be considered and examined in the light of dramaturgical theory and its constituent elements, rather than simply as a figure of speech, *rasavadalaṃkāra* , that possesses or furthers an emotion. The relation of 'soul' and 'body' of poetry has been established by Vāmana. Ānanda's structural rearrangement pivots on changing *rasavat* as a figure of speech to *rasa* , the *aṅgin* and *ātman* which cannot be directly denoted, only suggested and revealed. In the province of language analysis, the soul is more than the sum of its parts; it is illuminated by a cognition of its parts.

As a poet and critic, Ānanda's principal interest is directed to the nature of poetic words and their conveyance of meanings. In contradistinction to a suggested (*vyaṅgya*) poetry stands the opposite extreme of *citrakāvya* a painting-poetry in which poetic devices and their niceties are the sole source of aesthetic pleasure.[198] In between are poems whose suggested meanings

---

[197] Tilaka's commentary to Udbhaṭa, *KASS* 6.12, GOS 55, p. 51. "*pradhvaṃsābhāvaprāgabhāvākrāntā api bhāvāḥ svamahimnā vacaḥprasādavaśāc ca yat sphurattantava iva dṛśyamānā badhyante tadbhāvikam. vaktur āśayaḥ śrotary 'atrāstīti...[sa]hṛdayapraveśakṣamatvam iti vyākhyāyām rasavadādyalaṃkāratāpattiḥ* ."

[198] In his insistence that a 'portrait' poetry is not poetry, Ānanda may have directly opposed Vāmana's notion of beauty, Vāmana being an enthusiastic appreciator of the *rīti* as the soul of poetry in the same way that the lines of drawing are of a

are subordinated (*guṇībhūtavyaṅgya*), but the best and true poetry, says Ānanda, is that whose principal aim and success lie in conveying an emotion, one of the nine types. Ānanda's critical analysis hinges on the nature of language and *dhvani* almost to the exclusion of other possible kinds of poetic beauty.[199] Abhinava's task remains to construct a logical and psychological substantiation for Ānanda's basic theory.[200]

Suggestion and its mode of communication

To examine Ānandavardhana's structure of argumentation, we find that he introduces *dhvani* in the first *uddyota* by way of its detractors. Thus, Ānanda begins with the opponents' misconceptions and explains what a *dhvani* is not--a *lakṣaṇā, bhakti, guṇavṛtti, tātparya,* nor is it included among earlier enumerations of figures of speech. Having stated its definition in *Dhā* 1.4-5, he devotes *uddyota* s 2 and 3 to demonstrating what it is by examples. In 3.33 he returns again to arguments of what it is not--an inference or an inferred knowledge of the speaker's intention.[201]

---

picture. For discussion of Vāmana and *citrakāvya* see: D. N. Shukla, "Dhvanyabhāva-vādins and the Dhvanivādins," in *Principles of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit,* R.C. Dwivedi, ed. (Delhi: Motilal Bnarsidass, 1969) pp. 79ff.

199 Jeffrey M. Masson, *Theory of Suggestion in Sanskrit Poetics, (TSSP)* Ph. D Thesis. Cambridge, MA: 1971, p. 22. "It is not only that one must not directly name the emotion the poet seeks to create, but the poet must also not give away his intention through too direct use of words in general."

200 Masson, *TSSP,* p. 107 ff. Masson observes that Ānanda has provided no theory--definition, and philosophical explanation--of *rasa,* which becomes the focal point of a large part of Abhinava's theories on literature. Masson thinks Ānanda's intention is turned toward establishing *rasadhvani,* his audience being the older *ālaṃkārikas* and their followers, namely those who analyse poetry mechanically and conceive of poetry, after Daṇḍin and Bhāmana, as a body.

201 See Ingalls et al, 3.33o, p. 587.

Ānanda's concern is to provide not a logical proof, but rather an argument that *rasadhvani* exists because it has existed since the beginning of poetry, been known and taught traditionally,[202] and continues to exist so long as it is perceived and produced. That his language theory is based on the grammarians and particularly on Bhartṛhari is known from *Dhā* 1.13:

> When [*kārikā* 1.13] says 'Which the wise call *dhvani*,' this means that the term was invented by men of knowledge and that it has not been put into use inadvisedly. The preeminent men of knowledge are the grammarians, for all the sciences rest upon grammar; and they gave the name *dhvani* to the sounds of speech that are heard. In the same manner other wise men, who knew the true essence of poetry, have followed the example of the grammarians by giving the title *dhvani* to that verbal entity which contains a mixture of denotative and denoted elements and which is designated as 'a poem.' They did so because of the similarity [to acoustical *dhvani*] in its being a manifestor [of suggested meanings just as the heard sounds manifest words].[203]

Again in *Dhā* 3.33, Ānanda says:

> As for those scholars who have exactly determined the nature of brahma as it appears in speech [sc. the Grammarians], we adopted the term *dhvani* from their philosophy, so the question whether or not we are in conflict with them does not arise.[204]

By this last statement one is reminded immediately of *Vākyapadīya* 1.1, stating that the one and indivisible Brahman from whom the world proceeds is *Śabdatattva* because that Brahman is the substance of all modifications

202 *Dhā* 1.2.

203 Ingalls et al, tr., 1.13l, p. 169.

204 Ingalls et al, tr., 3.33m, p. 582.

which are apprehended by words and penetrated by words. All divisions of duration, creation, and cessation are shaped by the Word. The *vṛtti* goes on to say:

> And from being the cause of the alphabet (*akṣara*), it is called *akṣara*. The revelation of that [Brahma] who is entered within an individual consciousness flows forth for the sake of causing others to know [i.e., communicating with others]. Thus, indeed, he says,
>
> "Subtle Speech (*vācam*), whose essence is undivided from the meaning, not flowing forth, is one (*anabhiṣyandamānām*);
> others, indeed, know it to be otherwise--many in form and abiding in the soul."[205]

According to Bhartṛhari, *dhvani* is a subtle component of acoustic language, as opposed to the ideal and psychic aspects of language. *Dhvani*, a subtle vibration reveals the *sphoṭa,* the ideal meaning-bearing symbol.[206]

---

205 *VP* 1.1 *vṛtti,* DCMS 32, p. 7. "*tac cākṣaranimittatvād akṣaram ity ucyate. pratyakcaitanye 'ntaḥsaṃniveśitasya parasaṃbodhanārthā vyaktir abhiṣyandate. evaṃ hy āha sūkṣmām arthenāpravibhaktatattvām ekāṃ vācam anabhiṣyandamānām. utānye vidur anyām iva ca enāṃ nānārūpām ātmani sanniviṣṭām.*

The *paddhati* of Vṛṣabhadeva sums up, "*etad uktaṃ bhavati. pratipuruṣaṃ sarve varṇā buddhau kramasaṃhāreṇa bhedatirodhānena vāvatiṣṭhante, na tu tena rūpeṇa parasambhodo bhavatīti buddhis tāvat prāṇe 'rpayati, te prāṇavṛttyanugṛhītāḥ sthānakaraṇebhyo vyaktāḥ parasaṃbodhāya syandante sravantīti yāvat. pūrvaṃ rūpādiṣu sūkṣmaśabdānugamena brahmaṇi śabdatattvābhidhānam. iha tu sthūlavarṇākāratvenākṣaravyapadeśa iti viśeṣaḥ.*"

206 On *sphoṭa* see John Brough, "Theories of General Linguistics in the Sanskrit Grammarians (1951), in *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians,* J. F. Staal, ed., (2nd ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985, 1st ed. 1972) pp. 402-414. See also the same author's discussion of Ānandavardhana's use of *dhvani* with reference to Bhartṛhari in "Some Indian Theories of Meaning," in the same volume; K. Kunjunni Raja, *Idian theories of meaning,* pp. 109-119; and K. A. Subramania Iyer, *Bhartṛhari: A Study of the Vākyapadīya in the Light of the Ancient Commentaries,* Building Centenary and Silver

The vibration is effected through a desire to express (*vivakṣā*) which occurs in the mind (*buddhi*) of the speaker, moving the air to rise up in the chest and strike against places of utterance in the mouth and throat. This subtle vibration in turn is embodied and enlarged by [a body of] air (*nāda*) which reaches the hearer.[207]

Jubilee Series 68, (Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute 1969) pp.147-180.

[207] On *vivakṣā* see *VP* 1.13, DCMS 32, p. 44, "*arthasya pavṛttitattvaṃ vivakṣā, na tu vasturūpatayā sattvam asattvaṃ vā. vivakṣā hi yogyaśabdanibandhanā. yogyaṃ hi śabdaṃ prayoktā vivakṣāprāpitasaṃnidhāneṣv abhidheyeṣu pratyartham upādatte. tadyathopalipsamānaḥ prativiṣayaṃ yogyam evendriyam upalabdhau praṇidhatte.*" Verses 41-117 describe the manner in which the subtle word *sphoṭa*, which in itself is partless and sequenceless is transformed into physical words which are heard, by means of *dhvani*, the subtle vibration, and *nāda*, a body of air which enforms the vibration and reveals it. Bhartṛhari uses the metaphor of light to describe a word which illuminates itself and its meaning (1.44, 58-60). The hearer must first cognize what the word is through sounds heard, and subsequently grasps the meaning: 1.44 "*dvāv upādānaśabdeṣu śabdau śabdavido viduḥ/ eko nimittaṃ śabdānām aparo 'rthe prayujyate*". The imagery of light occurs in1.46-48 *araṇistha yathā jyotiḥ prakāśāntarakāraṇam/ tadvac chabdo 'pi buddhisthaḥ śrutīnāṃ kāraṇaṃ pṛthak.* 1.47 *vitarkitaḥ purā buddhyā kvacid arthe niveśitaḥ/ karaṇebhyo vivṛttena dhvaninā so 'nugṛhyate.* 1.48 *nādasya kramajanyatvān na pūrvo na paraś ca saḥ/ akramaḥ kramarūpeṇa bhedavān iva jāyate.*" Clearly, in these verses the grammarian shows that since communication (conveyance of meaning, *arthasya pravṛttitattvam vivakṣā*) consists in the speaker's employing a word appropriate to his intention (desire to express, *vivakṣā*), the imagery of light applies in as much as the word which is an idea in the mind of the speaker is the cause of sounds heard (*śruti*), just as the light in a fire-stick is the cause of other lights. This word, whose meaning is intended to be expressed, thought out first in the mind caused at sometime to be entered into a meaning, is assisted (favored, *anugṛhyate*) by *dhvani* which evolves upon the places of utterance; and the word which is in itself not sequential becomes differentiated because *nāda*, the air which manifests it, is produced in a sequence. Communication by means of language requires an objective ideality of a word possessing an eternal relation with its meaning, and the subjective aspect, namely, the meaning in the mind of the speaker is desired to be put across. This subjective aspect is postulated through a connection

The meaning, says Bhartṛhari, is a unified and indivisible whole, and it is the *vākyārtha,* a sentence-meaning. This is to say that although language understanding necessitates ideal parts which are phonemes, words, and so on, in the mind, what we understand through language is not merely a designation by reference to a bare thing as "that," (*tyad*).[208] A sentence-meaning even if expressed by a single word orients understanding in respect of time and place, provided with a subject and action. If we hear and understand one word, "tree," even there, the notion includes an elliptical verb 'to be' meaning that "there is a tree."

---

between the mind and breath: the speaker impels the air through his chest cavity, and it then strikes upon places of utterance, producing *dhvani* of the *śabda* in his mind. The relation between a *dhvani* and a *śabda* is expressed in 1.106, "*anavasthitakampe 'pi karaṇe dhvanayo 'pi te/ sphoṭād evopajāyante jvālā jvālāntarād iva.*" Even when the vocal action ceases to vibrate, the *dhvani*s are still produced from a *sphoṭa,* like a flame from another flame. Bhartṛhari sums up the relation between the ideal word, the light which illuminates itself and the meaning, in 1. 113-7. In transition to his exposition of the subjective language, he begins with verse 1.118 "The efficiency residing in words is the binder (basis) of the world; with that [efficiency] as its eyes, intuition itself is perceived in different appearances." Bhartṛhari compares the process of conveying the idea in the mind of the speaker to a three-fold process of painting in 1.52: "*yathaikabuddhiviṣayā mūrtir ākriyate paṭe/ mūrtyantarasya tritayam evaṃ śabde 'pi dṛśyate.*" Just as a person who is to be painted is first perceived with all his limbs, is composed in mind as one idea, and is then drawn out again with parts on a piece of cloth; just so, words that are heard become a single idea, and when the idea is made into *dhvani* through utterance, the words again become sequential. The *paddhati* explains that this process is a chain extending between the speaker and hearer in a relation of perceived and causing to be perceived, "***āvartamānaḥ*** iti *śrotṛvaktṛparamparayā grāhya iti grāhyatvaṃ svarūpaprakāśnād, arthaprakāśanād grāhakatvam.*"

208 *VP* 1.13 *vṛtti,* DCMS 32, p. 45 "*aparo 'rthaḥ. kevalaṃ vastu tyadādīnāṃ vastūpalakṣaṇāṃ viṣayamātram. tasyapravṛttitattvaṃ saṃsargaḥ. saṃsṛṣṭo hi kriyāsu guṇabhāvena pradhānabhāvena copādīyate.*"

Language is embedded in consciousness (*antaḥsaṃniveśitaḥ*), which is to say that language as an entity somehow "entered" into consciousness is *śabdatattva*. The use of language, the exercise of vocal organs and a natural ability to understand meanings, etc., is innate.[209] Bhartṛhari supports the notion of the intrinsicity of language by *āgama* : it is through beginningless and endless transmission of revealed words and subsidiary branches of learning that the world subsisting on knowledge knows of its origin. Knowledge in its earliest form is attributed to the seers who directly see reality. They see Brahman and, not being able to express this Unity, they tell of Brahman through the form of diversity, which is its *anukāra* , imitation; this form is subjective language (*vāc*).[210] The *vṛtti* of a later verse in the *VP* quotes Ṛg Vedic verses: "the bull with which one desires union, roars. The great god enters into mortals." [211] In the same way, *Śabdatattva* enters into and assumes the nature of human consciousness.

Thus, language as the fabric of communication possesses a structure which is both objective and subjective. From the perspective of subjective language, the use of language, as a linguistic entity, proceeds from the desire to express. A desire to express occurs on the mundane level of human communication, and underlies meaningfulness of a denotation. Iyer writes,

---

209 *VP* 1.122, DCMS 32, p. 187-9. " *tathā hy anupadeśasādhyāḥ pratibhāgamyāḥ eva karaṇavinyāsādayaḥ. ko hy etān puruṣadharmān anyatra śabdātmikāyāḥ kartuṃ pratipādayituṃ vā samartha iti.* " "For it is as follows: the projections of vocal action and so on are unlearned and are to be understood through intuition. For who can teach or establish tuese human qualities beside a disposition for language (*śabdabhāvanā*) which is of the nature of the Word."

210 See ch. 2 of this dissertation and ns. 31, 33.

211 *VP* 1.38, DCMS 32, pp. 199-201.

> The word has the power to convey the meaning, the power called *abhidhā,* but this power will work only when the speaker intends to apply it in a particular case. (*VP* 2.399) The actual application of the word by the speaker for conveying one of its meanings must be distinguished from his intention to do so. Thus, there are three things: (1) the power of the word to convey one or more meanings, which is natural and eternal (*abhidhā*) (2) the intention of the speaker to apply the word for conveying one of its meanings (*abhisaṃdhāna*) (3) the actual application (*ukti, viniyoga*).... Of the three things, the power of the word to convey its meaning is eternal. In actual speech, however, one begins with something which is in the speaker's mind, his desire or intention to say something particular. This is referred to by the word *abhisaṃdhāna* by Bhartṛhari. While explaining it, Puṇyarāja uses the word *pratibhā.* In this context, both mean the same thing. As the natural power of the word, namely, *abhidhā,* works only when the speaker intends that it should do so, the intention (*abhisaṃdhāna, pratibhā*) and the *abhidhā* are sometimes identified.[212]

In regard to suggestion (*dhvani*) as a function of language, Ānanda avers that he does not disagree with any existing notions, except that suggestion, *dhvani*, is not any of those things proposed by other schools as the poetic meaning. It is something that has been known and passed down traditionally but not formally defined.[213] Suggestion is a meaning which is perceived when the literal meaning has been perceived. In contradistinction to the claims of other theories of poetic meanings, it is not secondary or associated. Perceived on the basis of the literal meaning, it is primary and independent from the latter. It is not inferred, which is to say that it does not convey the intention but rather the object of the speaker's intention.[214]

---

212 K. A. Subramania Iyer, "Bhartṛhari on the Primary & Secondary Meanings of Words," in *Indian Linguistics,* vol. 29 (1968): 97-112 (Poona: Deccan College, Linguistics Society of India), p. 101.

213 *Dhā* 1.1., VSS 97, p. 8.

Given that the essence language is a communication of a speaker's desire to express something to the hearer who perceives the meaning, just as the grammarian's *dhvani* illuminates the word and the meaning, so in Ānanda's poetics *dhvani,* the suggestive function inherent in language illuminates the poetic meaning after the literal meaning is perceived. Ordinary language is used to communicate directly what the speaker wants to express. In the language of poetry, what is spoken is not the author's personal direct expression, i.e., he is not causing a knowledge about himself personally. The second meaning is possible because the object of communication, the *vivakṣita* of the poet,[215] is a *rasa,* which is the soul of poetry and the aim of poetic communication.

It is in this sense that Ānanda says that poetic language does not communicate the poet's *vivakṣā,* i.e., the desire on the part of the poet to directly express something for and about himself personally. But the object desired to be expressed is a *rasa,* which is made the aim of poetic language by means of suggestive function.

A suggested meaning is not inferrable (*anumeya*), nor is it a the

---

214 *Dhā* 3.33, see Ingalls et al, trs., pp. 582-594. "Therefore, to sum up: words operate like inferential marks only when the suggested element is in the form of the speaker's intention; but when the suggested element is turned into object of the speaker's intention, they operate as things to be communicated." (p. 588)

215 Ibid. "But the suggestiveness that comes from the revealing an intention on the part of the speaker is common to all human sentences without distinction. It is not apart from the denotative power, for that which is suggested in this case is inseparably present with it. This, however, is not true of a suggestion which the speaker wishes to convey (*vivakṣita*). It is where what is suggested stands as intended to be conveyed that the suggestiveness [of the sentence] can prompt us to call it *dhvani* (suggestive poetry). (p. 582) See also n. 1, p. 583.

speaker's intention (*tātparya*). Ānanda resorts to explaining that the relation of a suggested meaning to a word is an *upādhi*-- its adventitious character depends precisely on the understander, the *sahṛdaya* or sympathetic reader in whom such a meaning is evoked by poetic language. The suggested meaning is illuminated by the literal meaning, as a pot by a lamp and stands in a *prakāśyaprakāśana* relation to the literal meaning.

Dhā 3.33 gives a rather roundabout explanation of the adventitious, *aupādhika*: since the relation of a word and its meaning is eternal, in order to distinguish the falsity of human sentences from the truth of Vedic sentences, one must posit an adventitious character of the deviations in human sentences. If poetic suggestiveness which illuminates the speaker's intention is adventitious, it would then result that all personal statements are suggestive. Ānanda says this is true, except that in ordinary communication a suggested meaning is inherent in the literal meaning, but not as what is desired to be expressed. An utterance whose object is revealed as what is desired to be expressed is the suggestiveness that instigates the operation of *dhvani*. This adventitious character of a suggested meaning depends on a subjective and contextual interpretation: the moon which is cool to all other people causes pains to those who are desolate in love. Or again, what is desired to be expressed may be something quite different from the literal meaning which is the *vivakṣā* or the speaker's intention (*vaktrabhiprāya*).[216] For example, when the amorous

---

[216] *Dhā* 3.33, VSS 97, p. 479-480. "*nanu anena nyāyena sarveṣām eva laukikānāṃ vākyānāṃ dhvanivyāpāraḥ prasaktaḥ. sarveṣām apy anena nyāyena vyañjakatvāt. satyam etat; kiṃ tu vaktrabhiprāyaprakāśanena yad vyañjakatvaṃ tat sarveṣām eva laukikānāṃ vākyānām aviśiṣṭam. tat tu vācakatvān na bhidyate vyaṅgyaṃ hi tatra nāntarīyakatayā vyavasthitam. na tu vivakṣitatvena. yasya tu*

woman says to the monk, "Wander freely, O gentle monk...," if the desire to express is also the object of the expression, then the literal meaning (*vācya*) coincides with the suggested meaning (*vyaṅgya*); and it is understood that the monk should wander freely. But when the fierce lion is brought into the picture, it is understood that the woman's real desire, which is the object of her expression, is to prohibit the monk from wandering and thus to save her trysting place. The understanding of the prohibition is adventitious because it depends on contextual factors--a woman in love and a monk in fear-- which are not known to all and are not inherent in the word-meaning relation itself.

Ānanda differs from the Mīmāṃsaka's theories of language, which provide for secondary and extended meanings through functions of *guṇavṛtti* and *tātparyaśakti*, particularly on the point that the suggested meaning is independent of the first, literal meaning. Bhartṛhari's theory of language makes perceptible the difference between linguistic and objective language and the subjective desire to express underlying the use of language. Thus it gives scope to a difference between understanding what a word means, which is a linguistic function, and understanding what the speaker intends to say which is a subjective understanding.

Furthermore, the sentence is a unit of understanding because of an indeterminacy of a word (through homonymy and polysemy, etc.), whose determinate meaning is figured through its relations with other words in the sentence, in the mind of the speaker and the hearer. Associations of a word with other words and contextual nuances characteristic of subjective

vivakṣitatvena vyaṅgyasya sthitiḥ tadvyañjakatvaṃ dhvanivyavahārasya prayojakam."

understanding are the basis of a figurative usage of words and their meanings.[217] Thus, according to Bhartṛhari, in real communication, one understands not the literal word-meanings but rather the sense conveyed by the whole sentence consisting of words that are mutually determining.[218] Such explanations of meanings and senses in figurative usages no doubt had a great deal of influence on Ānanda.

Vivakṣā is fundamentally different from *tātparyaśakti* of the Mīmāṃsakas. Although the ritualists agree with grammarians that the word-meaning relation is eternal, that a word is defined by its pragmatic use, i.e., what is understood by it, and that language communication presupposes an appropriate mental apparatus, Mīmāṃsakas admit only the material word-sounds (*śabda*) occurring in a sequence, as the cause of understanding.[219] Therefore, the ritualists can account for figurative usages only as variants of the first meaning, because of the presumption of a *tātparyaśakti* inherent in the words.[220] The Prābhākara's theory that the

217 *VP* 2. 250-256, Iyer, tr., *VP* II, pp.108-112.

218 *VP* 2.310-326, Iyer, tr., *VP* II, pp. 134-140.

219 See *Ślokavarttika*, sūtra 5, section 12 (on *sphoṭa*): "123. The Ablative in "Śabdāt" (in the sentence "*Śabdāt arthapratītiḥ*") signifies causal agency. In your theory too, there would be an intervening factor between the cognition of meaning (and the cognition of the Word,--the manifestation of *Sphoṭa* being the intervening factor). 124. That is said to be subsidiary, which, being known in one shape, is used in another. And (in the case of the Word) we are not cognisant of any other form of causality (than the one we lay down) 125. The intervention of the operation of the cause itself is common to all causes; and in the case of the Word, it is only this operation of itself (which is found to intervene between the Word and its signification); therefore there is no real intervention at all." Ganganath Jha, tr., *Ślokavārttika*, (Repr. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1985 (1st published 1908)), pp. 279-280.

220 Abhinava interprets *guṇavṛtti*, a secondary function, through presumption whenever the denotation has a *skhaladgati*, and *lakṣaṇā* as the power to manifest a

word of denotation extends as far as the meaning is taken to task by Abhinava who shows that a multivalent meaning, its nuances coming immediately to mind, cannot be caused sequentially by individual words. Such a meaning does not stop and start again, but rather suggestion is a single field of perception in which several evoked images come to mind at once, without a sequential arrangement. Since a verbal operation occurs at once without pausing, a multivalent meaning cannot be, as the Mīmāṃsakas say, an operation in which the same words give rise to several, literal and figurative, meanings.[221]

---

meaning in dependence of the sublation of the primary meaning, etc., as the cooperating cause. The primary meaning is simply the power of conveying a meaning in dependence on convention. Abhinava first concedes that *dhvani* operates after the previous three functions, and then denies that secondary usage exists at all in the type of suggestion based on the power of meaning. The argument here is an interesting one: the difference in cooperating cause results in the difference of power, *śaktibheda*. What kind of power? The examples he gives show that it is the power of the operation of different means of knowledge. The same word, assisted by pervasion, memory, and so on, gives to infer the speaker's intention, but assisted by the senses results in the operation of a determinate perception. Abhinava's theory of knowledge is clearly at work here: the kind of knowledge and perception we gain depends on words and the cooperating causes--which are subjective factors--such as the memory of pervasion in inference and the senses in a *vikalpa*, a determinate perception. It is a short step from here to Abhinava's use of *pratibhā* as the cooperating cause of poetic appreciation, which is a kind of perception. See *DhāL* 1.4, VSS 97, pp. 58-62.

Cf. *VP* 1.46 *vṛtti*, DCMS 32, pp. 74-75, "*na hi śabdasya kramavatī viramya viramya svārthādiṣu vṛttiḥ sambhavati. sakṛd uccāraṇāt.*" "For, it is not possible that a word pause again and again in the sequential conveying of its own meanings. Because [its] untterance is once."

221 In the argument against the Prābhākara Mīmāṃsakas, whose position comes very close to that of the grammarians in saying that the verbal operation extends as far as the meaning and that this extended meaning arises instantaneously, Abhinava points to a fundamental difference with the grammarians, the *sphoṭavādin*s. The Mīmāṃsaka's sense of *jhaṭ iti* comprises a series of understandings that occur so quickly they seem

The foregoing discussion has shown that the ideas of the soul of poetry and of *rasa* as an independent entity (not a figure of speech) have been presaged by Vāmana and Udbhaṭa. Ānanda makes the strategic shift of *rasa* from the position of a *rasavat* figure of speech to that of the soul of poetry: it occupies the position of *aṅgin*, the whole to which the parts, *aṅga* s, are subordinated. In this structure, within the realm of poetic propriety, *aucitya* --which includes appropriateness of the subject matter, believability of actions, and suitability of subsidiary motifs as well as poetic devices--every element of a poem should be created with the aim of producing a *rasa*. This *aṅgāṅgin* relation in poetry between a *rasa* and its subsidiary parts also allows the treatment of the literal along with its figurative and secondary meanings as causes of poetic beauty, subsidiary to the whole and the highest aim, namely, a *rasa*. Suggestion, *dhvani*, is thus primarily divided into the *avivakṣitavācya* and *vivakṣitānyaparavācya* types.[222] In the former, the literal meaning is entirely suppressed or transferred to another meaning. In the latter type, traditional poetic elements are admitted as causes of beauty if they are subordinated to suggesting a *rasa*. Ānanda likens the relation of expressed to suggested meaning to that of a lamp and a pot; [223] and it follows that since both upon

---

instantaneous, but the *sphoṭavādin* s say that the meaning which is a *sphoṭa* is partless, *avibhakta*. The metaphysical corollary indicates a parallel between language and cosmology: the relation of the manifold world to Brahman, *Śabdatattva*, is that of *dhvani* in language to *sphoṭa*, which is *avibhakta*, and a *vākya*. *DhāL* 1.4, VSS 97, pp. 62-67.

222 According to *Dhā* 3.33i *A*, Ingalls et al, tr., p. 565, this division is made according to the dependence of suggestion on the literal meaning in *vivakṣitānyaparavācya*, or on secondary usage in *avivakṣitavācya*. "And it was in order to show this double dependence that the very first analysis of *dhvani* was into these two divisions."

being cognized do not disappear, they are distributed as principal and subordinate.[224] Thus, the defining characteristic of poetry is essentially the suggestion of a *rasa*, (*rasadhvani*), and poetry is in the sphere of *rasadhvani* if the poet has *rasa* as his intention, i.e., the ultimately conveyed object of his composition, while striving to convey it by means of suggestive words. With *rasa* as the whole, Ānanda shows that every part of speech,[225] including a preposition (*pra*)[226] and a conjunction (*ca*),[227] can suggest an emotion.

That true poetry is characterised by *rasadhvani* is illustrated by the negative concomitance of *rasa* in *citra* poetry, in *DhĀ* 3.41-2. In this instance, the critic is unequivocal about what is real poetry, and why:

> That which is different from these, namely poetry which lacks *rasa* or an emotion (*bhāva*) as its final meaning, which lacks the power to reveal any particular suggested meaning, which is composed only by relying on

223 *Dhā* 3.33f, Ingalls et al., tr., p 557-8, and below, n. 75,

224 *Dhā* 3.33g, Ingalls et a.l, tr., p. 560. "We reply that there is no such fault here, because the two [meanings] are distributed as principal and subordinate. Sometimes the suggested sense is predominant and the expressed sense subordinate. Sometimes the expressed sense is predominant and the suggested sense subordinate. Of these [alternatives], where the suggested sense is predominant we have what is called suggestive poetry (*dhvani*). Where the expressed sense is predominant we have a different type of poetry] that will be described in what follows." Abhinava calls the second type *guṇībhūtavyaṅgya*." (p. 561).

225 *Dhā* 3.1ff, Ingalls et al., tr., p. 369ff. It may be said that Ānanda includes among "factors which act as suggestors," which Abhinava enumerates as "words, sentences, phonemes, word-components, texture (saṅghatanā), and long sections of poetry," and which he says can never be suggested (p. 370), the traditional elements, the "body," in earlier literary criticism.

226 Ingalls et al., trs., 3.16h, pp 464-465.

227 Ingalls et al., tr., 316f, p. 453.

> novelties of literal sense and expression, and which gives the appearance of a picture, is *citra*. It is not real poetry [just as a picture is not the real thing], for it is an imitation of poetry.... But what is this thing called *citra,* where there is no touch of a suggested meaning? For suggested meaning has already been shown to be of three sorts. Now we may let the word *citra* apply to that case where there is no suggestion of a thing (or situation) or of a figure of speech. But where there is no reference to the *rasa* s, etc., there cannot be any type of poetry at all. Because poetry cannot be about nothing; and everything in the world necessarily becomes a constituent of a *rasa* or a *bhāva*, if only by its ultimately being a determinant (*vibhāva*) thereof. This is because the *rasa* s are particular states of mind and there is nothing that does not produce some state of mind. If there were, it would not be in the area of poetry.[228]

It is said, in effect, that the substance (*vastu*)[229] of poetry consists in its being productive of some state of mind, and poetry is that which renders everything in the world a constituent of one or another emotion, which is a state of mind. In comparison to an aesthetic communication and appreciation described by Lienhard, Ānanda's explanation of what poetry is and how it should be appreciated is a radical innovation.

Ānanda's conception of unity created by a *rasa* as the *aṅgin* is very clearly shown in *Dhā* 4.5, "While this relation of suggestor and suggested may be various, a poet who possesses *rasa,* and so on, should be attentive to one." [230] And,

---

228 Ingalls et al, tr., *Dhā,* p. 636. " *cittavṛttiviśeṣā hi rasādayaḥ, na ca tad asti vastu kiñcid yan na cittavṛttiviśeṣam upajanayati tadutpādane vā kaviviṣayataiva tasya na syāt.* "

229 *vastu* which is the *tattva* See *Dhā* 1.6 and *vṛtti* where Ānanda glosses ' *arthavastu* ' with ' *vastutattva.* '

230 *Dhā* 4.5, VSS 97, p. 539. " *vyaṅgyavyañjakabhāve 'smin vividhe sambhavaty api/ rasādimaya ekasmin kaviḥ syād avadhānavān.* "

> In the *Rāmāyaṇa* the *karuṇarasa* (the flavor of compassion or tragic mood) is prepared by the first of poets himself, where he says that his "grief became verse." He carries out the same *rasa* throughout his composition up to Rāma's final, irreversible separation from Sītā.[231]

The *Mahābhārata*, with its complicated structure of stories within stories, is astoundingly conceived by Ānanda as a unity bound by its single *rasa* of the peaceful (*śānta*). Daṇḍin's and Bhāmaha's definitions of a *bhāvika* make it a quality that proceeds from the *bhāva* or *abhiprāya* of the poet. A *bhāvika* contains a coherence in the arrangement of poetic parts, making them appear vividly as if they were before the eyes. In regard to a compositional coherence being a function of the poet's imagination (in Gerow's sense of the word), Ānanda seems to have the support of tradition for his views concerning the unity of a composition, with the difference that in the place of *bhāva*, there is the poet's *rasa*. And in the place of *bhāvika* there is the poet's *pratibhā*.

Suggested meaning and the poet's intuition

Ānanda states that the *ślāghyaḥ* meaning, which is the soul and substance of poetry and which is not known by a literal expression, is *dhvani*. This meaning which is to be praised by a sensitive audience as the substance, being soul of the body which is beautiful because of lovely and appropriate configurations, is of two kinds: the literal and the "felt."[232] The

---

231 Ingalls et al., tr., *Dhā* 4.5, p. 690.

232 *Dhā* 1.2, *vṛtti*, VSS 97, p. 45. "*kāvyasya hi lalitocitasanniveśacāruṇaḥ śarīrasyevātmā sārarūpatayā sthitaḥ sahṛdayaślāghyo yo 'rthas tasya vācyaḥ pratīyamānaś ce ti dvau bhedau.*" I have translated '*pratīyamāna*' as 'felt' here

latter is the meaning which when perceived leads to a *rasa*. The critic says that still something else is felt (*pratīyamāna*) which is very well known (*suprasiddha*) to the sympathetic audience apart from the well known (*prasiddha*) ornamented limbs. Verses 1.4-6 form a single context:

pratīyamānaṃ punar anyad eva vastv asti vāṇīṣu mahākavīnām
yat tat prasiddhāvayavātiriktaṃ vibhāti lāvaṇyam ivāṅganāsu.

kāvyasyātmā sa evārthas tathā cādikaveḥ purā
krauñcadvandvaviyogotthaḥ śokaḥ ślokatvam āgataḥ.

sarasvatī svādu tad arthavastu niḥṣyandamānā mahatāṃ kavīnām
alokasāmānyam abhivyanakti parisphurantaṃ pratibhāviśeṣam.

Ānanda tells us what "something else" there is that the sensitive audience feels. "It is just this meaning that is the soul of poetry. And so it was that, long ago, grief, arising in the first poet from the separation of the pair of curlews, became verse."[233] And this "meaning substance" (*arthavastu*) flown out from Sarasvatī to the poets reveal [their] extraordinary, vibrant and special *pratibhā*. In these verses it is shown that the real meaning, (i.e., suggestion) which is the soul of poetry, arises in the poet.[234] And it is

---

because I think that 'felt' carries a stronger flavor of being a real perception of greater aesthetic value than the directly expressed meaning. And because it is the meaning that leads eventually to *rasa*, I use "felt," in order to contrast its emotional potentials with the intellective nature of literal and implied meanings in ordinary usage.

233 Ingalls et al., tr., *Dhā* 1.5, p. 113. The wording of these two verses merits some pondering: the poet's bursting into poetic language is an instance of the soul of poetry. It is not the reverse, i.e., that the sorrow of the poet has been rendered into a verse, and consequently a significant meaning derived from that becomes the soul of poetry.

234 Ingalls, n. 1, p. 113, "It was this element arising in Vālmīki, whether one regard it with Ānanda as the *bhāva, śoka*, or with Abhinava as the *karuṇarasa*, that produced

Sarasvatī or *bhāratī* (*vāc*) who reveals the *alokasāmānyam parisphurantam pratibhāviśeṣam* in him.[235] Gerow rightly observes that Indian poetics does not equate creativity with individuality: the poet's greatest gift is a gift from the goddess.

Suggested meanings are understood after the literal meanings have been understood, but they are independent and primary.[236] The literal meaning is discarded in the first category of suggested meaning, *avivakṣitavācya*, and subordinated to another meaning in *vivakṣitānyaparavācya*. The best kind of poetry is that in which the suggested meaning alone is most prominent. Suggested meaning, Ānanda argues, is revealed, *vyajyate*, and it cannot be a *lakṣaṇā* or *bhakti*, or *guṇavṛtti*, since the meanings of these three types of secondary meanings depend on their literal meanings.

Once again we defer to the wisdom of Bhartṛhari in that while the Mīmāṃsaka theory of meaning states that acoustical phonemes, sequentially apprehended and combined in a syntactical combination, directly evoke meanings, Bhartṛhari's theory of meaning posits a *sphoṭa* between word-sounds and their meanings. Words illuminate themselves and their meanings. In this sense, the speaker's intention is inherent in the linguistic symbol (*sphoṭa*) in the minds of the speaker and the hearer. The speaker's intention takes up a word (*śabda*), and the mind, linked with breath through the efficiency distributed in both, moves the breath to produce the

---

the first poem, for it is *rasa*, etc., that gives life to poetry as the soul gives life to the body. Note that Ānanda's concept of *bhāva* and *rasa* is much simpler than Abhinava's. To Ānanda *rasa* is no more than the sharpening of Vālmīki's emotion of grief."

235 *Dhā* 1.5-6, KSS 135, pp. 84-93.

236 See *Dhā* 1.9ff.

dhvani of a word's *sphoṭa*. In apprehension, the phonetic sounds heard are resolved in a combination (*anusaṃdhāna*) into a partless *vākyārtha* or *vākyasphoṭa* (the sentence-meaning), apprehended as a whole.[237]

Language sounds are different from random sounds because they are governed by ideal words in the mind.[238] Between words and meanings, there intervenes a mental synthesis--a combination of word-efficiencies into a single and meaningful whole--from which a sudden flash of understanding arises. This sudden understanding is an intuition, *pratibhā*. It is said in *VP* 2.143 that *pratibhā* is the sentence-meaning (*vākyārtha*), a partless and instantaneous understanding which cannot be repeated even by the perceiver. On the subjective side of language, intuition mediates heterogeneous facets of words and a homogeneous understanding, just as the *sphoṭa* mediates diverse and unified aspects of words on the objective, linguistic side.

This theory stands between the Buddhists' view of language as conventionally instituted and mentally produced, and the realist Naiyāyika and Mīmāṃsaka positions in which language consists of real word-sounds corresponding to real things in the world. In the first position, in literary critical usage, since words are unreal their meanings are also ineffable, and all the more so suggested meaning in poetic language. In the second position, since meanings are directly evoked by word-sounds, there can logically be no other material cause for a suggested meaning. The ritualists furnish *tātparya*, the speaker's intention, as the cause for explaining

237 See chater 2 and nn. 206, 207 above.

238 See for discussion on *sphoṭa* in K. Kunjunni Rāja, *Indian Theories of Meaning*, pp. 116-136.

extended or non-literal meanings such as in the phrases, 'a village on the Ganges,' or 'the boy is a lion.' When a literal sense cannot be made out of such phrases from an *abhidhā śakti*, they say that it must be a product of *tātparyaśakti*, the speaker's intention to qualify a village or a boy contextually.

In Bhartṛhari's theory, language as a linguistic entity presupposes an eternal connection between words and meanings. As a subjective entity, making sense out of words and their meanings is a subconscious process that comes to mind as a sudden intuition. Kumārila's objection against *sphoṭavāda* is precisely that the *sphoṭa* and *saṃskāra* s intervene, as subconscious processes, between a cognition of a word and the cognition of its meaning. These processes, says the Mīmāṃsaka, are inherent in the causal activities of words.[239] The *VP* attempts to explain the complexity of verbal understanding: the partless and sequenceless understanding is always intertwined with linguistic possibilities, which is to say that a meaning as an idea is an idea only to the extent that it can be put into words and communicated by means of words. Understanding, which is intuitive, is impalpable; it becomes expressed and embodied by sounds of words. The intuitive works in the hearer and the speaker: it is the sentence-meaning apprehended by the hearer, and the origin of ideas that become the three stages of Speech, *paśyantī*, *madhyam*, and *vaikharī*, in increasing degrees of perceptible manifestation.

The poetic function of *dhvani* does not cancel out its linguistic function, naturally. Here, there is a question whether a suggested meaning stands to a

[239] See above, n. 219.

literal meaning as a literal meaning to a sentence-meaning. Ānanda says no, because the knowledge of the literal meaning, which illuminates the suggested meaning, does not disappear when the latter is known. Both meanings are intended to be understood, but only the suggested meaning is intended significantly.[240] The particular property of a *dhvani* which characterizes it as linguistic is that it consists of air vibrations, conveying the *sphoṭa* which signifies a mental content, a desire to communicate something. A poetic *dhvani* does not depart from this character: it carries further the desire to express in a manner proper to poetry something further, which can be a fact, a figure of speech, or a *rasa*.

Ānandavardhana's concept of intuition

The new *rasika* poet is exhorted to cultivate his feelings in observations not of words-and-meanings and their artful arrangements alone but also in such things that are immediate to his feelings; he should recollect the significant *ślāghya*, i.e., suggested, meaning, and he should look to the beauty of the world of nature in its glorious variety, in order to enrich the age-old themes of poetry.[241] *Pratibhā* in this sense is not merely a genius for his craft, for which Ānanda uses the term *śakti* to denote a power which can make a poem effective in spite of spoiling effects of impropriety.[242]

240 *Dhā* 3.33f, Ingalls et al., trs., p. 557.

241 *Dhā* 4. 7, Ingalls et al., p. 704-708.

242 *Dhā* 3.6.e, Ingalls et al., trs., p. 409. "If you ask how it is that sensitive readers nonetheless find beauty in such instances, our reply is: because the aberration is concealed by the poet's skill (*śakti*).... And so it is that the impropriety of a great poet, such as his well-known writing of the sexual enjoyment of the highest gods, does not appear as vulgarity because it is concealed by his skill."

Neither is it simply imagination and inspiration, but rather it is a combination of intuition that is productive of originality as well as an insight into human nature from which arise emotional conditions now brought within the legitimate province of poetry. By a poet's *pratibhā* there is freshness and originality because the poet evokes a special kind of perception of words that suggest something real.

We may look to Pratīhārendurāja's commentary on Udbhaṭa, emphasizing the emotional content of poetry: "Because poetry is emotional (or flavorful), a poem, truly, must be emotional, not unemotional, because its body is of words and meanings refined by qualities."[243] Ānanda conceives of an emotive aesthetic perception because it begins as a *rasa* in the poet and ends as the *rasa* in a *sahṛdaya*. It is this real thing (*vastu*) that suggestions and suggestiveness of language are empowered to cause to be understood. Ānanda's own feelings on this matter appear throughout and particularly in his own verse in *Dhvanyāloka* 3.43:

> I am weary from much painting of the world,
> for though I used the new and wondrous sight of poets
> which busies itself in giving taste to feeling
> and used the insight of philosophers
> which shows us objects as they really are,
> I never found, O God recumbent on the Ocean,
> a joy like that which comes from the love of thee."[244]

---

243 Pratīhārendurāja, *Laghuvṛtti*, Banhatti ed., p. 81. *kāvyasya sarasatvāt. kāvyaṃ khalu guṇasaṃskṛtaśabdārthaśarīratvāt sarasam eva bhavati na tu nīrasam.*

244 Ingalls et al., tr., *Dhā* 3.43b, p. 653. "*yā vyāpāravatī rasān rasayitum kācit kavīnāṃ navā/ dṛṣṭir yā pariniṣṭhatārthaviṣayonmeṣā ca vaipaścitī/ te dve apy avalambya viśvam aniśanirvarṇayanto vayaṃ/ śrāntā naiva ca labdham abdhiśayana tvadbhaktitulyaṃ sukham.*"

If Ānanda thinks of himself as a typical modern poet, it may be said that poetness (*kavitva*) consists in seeing the new and wondrous things that give taste to feeling, and in seeing things in their true nature. Abhinava glosses 'sight' (*dṛṣṭi*) as *pratibhāna*, i.e., intuition.

Ānanda has much to say, in the fourth *uddyota*, concerning the soul of poetry and the poet's *pratibhā*. With the help of *dhvani*, the poet's *pratibhā* is endless.[245] Here, he means the imagination is endless. The critic also speaks of a 'modern' poet like the great ones, the first poet or Kālidāsa, whose language flows from an abundance of feelings. Freshness and originality of imagination require an attention to the real world and to one's own feelings evoked by images in the world. It is this kind of creation, not entirely devoted to literal meanings and intracacies of poetic devices but drawing the audience into the poem's dramatic reality, that Ānanda extols. The poetician paints this picture of the poet in his world:

> In poetry's endless worlds
> the poet alone is God;
> the universe revolves
> according to his nod.
>
> If the poet writes of love,
> the world assumes its flavor;
> if he becomes dispassionate,
> all things lose their savor.
>
> A true poet may treat unliving things
> as living, and living as unliving;
> his wish sole master of all properties

---

245 *Dhā* 4.1, Ingalls et al., trs., p. 678.

by his withdrawal or his giving.[246]

The poet is god: he imparts his own *rasa* or its lack to the world of his imagination. If one argues that a make-belief world lacks immediacy, on the contrary, says Ānanda. If one speaks of tradition and general types of poetic matters, poetry has always been composed with immediacy of feelings. The first, great poet composed verses out of an overflow emotion. If even one poet after Vālmīki is admitted to be great, then it is proven that novelty and originality are possible within the generalities of poetic matters.[247] And there are such poets as Kālidāsa and others. Ānanda writes,

> For just as the nature of the universe, although it has manifested this marvellous proliferation of matter through the succession of past ages, cannot be said now to be worn out and unable to create anything new, just so is the situation in poetry, which, although it has been worked over by the minds of countless poets, is not thereby weakened, but increases with ever new artistic abilities.[248]

Ānanda's conception of a *rasa* as the 'soul' can be summed up thus: the soul of poetry, as a dimension ungoverned by literal denotations, is delight to a *sahṛdaya*. It is perceptible through suggestive language by which the feelings of a poet and his audience are in tune. Such implied meanings over

246 *DhĀ*, 3.43 *vṛtti*, VSS 97, 530. See Ingalls et. al., tr., p. 653; and Ingalls' n1, "The literal meaning of the word *dṛṣṭi* is shifted by metonymy to the meaning "poetic imagination.." See also Abhinavagupta's gloss : "Sight: that is, in the form of poetic imagination (*pratibhā*). The *dhvani* in the word 'sight' is asisted by this figure.... [The word "sight"] is shifted to aother sense, to the sense of imagination which blossoms forth from the constant practice of ocular perception." (Ingalls et al, tr., p. 654).

247 *DhĀ* 4.7, Ingalls et al. p. 710.

248 Ingalls et al., trs., *DhĀ* 4.10, p. 715.

and above literal meanings have been in the thoughts of Udbhaṭa, although it is by no means clear by what mechanism they are implied.[249] What other meanings could there be besides those that words literally or figuratively express? Ānandavardhana's creation of a new category of meaning is not only daring, but as Ingalls says, "The suggestion opens up a new world." This world is consummated in the audience's sympathetic perception. Poetic meanings are felt, so to speak, in the heart of a *sahṛdaya*.

Ānanda takes this 'soul' dimension further than questions of the nature of language in grammar and literary criticism: poetry does not immortalize deeds because of its extraordinary beauty. Poetry is a universe of its own, and great poets are *Prajāpati* s, creator-gods. In this sense, a literary work does not record some objective facts by representing them. It is immortal because poetic language does not denote or stand for another real thing. If true poetry is appreciated by means of suggestive language, its existence can be only in the present. It is the endless world created ever anew on the filaments of the poet's and the reader's *rasa*. Poetry is a state of mind (which Ānanda says what it is all about), and its endlessness rests in the hearts of people in whom a poem holds sway rather than in the 'body' of material, poetic elements.

Ānanda speaks of the *rasa* s in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* as quintessential, transcendent sentiments. These epic poems are testimonies in subjective experiences of things more real than individual persons and their doings. Inasmuch as humans are capable of feelings of *adbhuta,*

---

[249] Ingalls et al., trs., introduction, p. 8 on Udbhaṭa's distinction between meanings given *śrutyā* and *arthena*.

karuṇa, *śānta*, for example, and are capable of turning them into and culling them from poetry, we are intertwined with the divine beyond the minimal world of meaningless actions. Poetry speaks of things that in time become godly, and of ultimate goals reached by insights into the agency of forcefully driving emotions as they impel humans headlong toward different ends, holy and unholy.

Whether in Vedic conception of poets as truth-seers, or in earlier poeticians' descriptions of the poet's *bhāva* as the sustainer of internal reality, or in Udbhaṭa's notion of coherence (*ānukulyam*), the poet's intuition is the instinctive design behind a great sprawling panorama. It is this design which lends truth and coherence to poetry. For Ānanda, a literary work is a unity because a *rasa* exists in the poet and forces him to conclusions that are consonant with it: he knows in his heart where the piece is leading up to even before beginning to compose.[250]

After Ānanda, discussions revolve around the nature of *rasa*--what it is and how it is conveyed. Ingalls is of the opinion that Ānanda views it after the old school, i.e., that it is an intensification of *bhāva*.[251] It is possible

---

[250] *Dhā* 4.5, Ingalls et al., trs., p. 690. "In the *Rāmāyaṇa* the *karuṇarasa* (flavor of compassion or tragic mood) is prepared by the first of poets himself, where he says that his "grief became verse." He carries out the same *rasa* throughout his composition up to Rāma's final, irreversible separation from Sītā."

[251] Ingals et al., trs., *Dhā*, introduction, p. 18. "Ānanda uses the word *rasa* of a basic emotion that has been heightened, sometimes from whatever reason, but most specifically from the combination prescribed by *BhNŚ*.... Here *rasa* is simply a heightened form of peaceful happiness (*sukha*).... Ānanda conceives this *rasa* to abide in the character invented by the poet or in the poet himself, as well as in the audience. As for the first: "The speaker may be the poet or a character invented by the poet. If the latter, he may be devoid of *rasa* and *bhāva*, or he may be possessed of *rasa* and *bhāva*" (3.6.g *A*). As for the poet himself, it is when he is under such a heightened state

that the question never occurs because to him the essential thing is that *rasa* exists as that which is conveyed in poetic language. In the realm of poetry, it is a given that personal emotions are quite different from aesthetic emotions, as poetry is different from a real situation in life. Personal feelings may underlie poetic utterances, but an aesthetic action in regard to literary and dramatic works is relatively limited in comparison to real actions, or philosophical attitudes, which a person takes toward moral and spiritual goals. In the fourth *uddyota*, it is said that great poems such as the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* lead to the *rasa* s of compassion and peace, and in that sense they link us with some ultimate truth--the presence of the divine on earth and the ultimate futility of worldly glories.

Even so, sentiments are suggested: the sensitive reader is immersed in such aesthetic emotions, but he does not become liberated. Aesthetic feelings are confined to the world of art, and aesthetic actions do not go beyond the realm of *rasa*. Or, having brought together in his thought the grammarians' theory of language and Bharata's theory of drama, Ānanda is satisfied to say that poetic language has a primary emotional content which it conveys by means of the linguistic function called suggestion. He implicitly accepts Bharata's definitions and explanations of *rasa* s and *bhāva* s. Thus, the *rasādi* s would occur as Bharata describes wherever poetic language functions suggestively, in the poet who uses it, in the poetry which contains it, and in the audience which is sensitive to poetry's true meanings. Ānanda mentions in a general way (as does Udbhaṭa in the fourth *varga* of *KASS*) that *rasa* s are engendered by the *vibhāva* s and so

of emotion as *rasa* that he becomes capable of writing the suggestive poetry that will transfer this *rasa* to his hearers."

on; there is no evidence that he is interested in the psychology of different emotional states or in other explanations of such emotional factors besides their conventionally prescribed relevance to *rasa* s in poetic language. What is dramatically portrayed by an actor's *abhinaya* --such as an *anubhāva* of horripilation, stereotyped mannerisms such as plucking flower petals or scratching the ground with one's foot--can equally be described in poetry and thereby contextually suggest an emotion.

It may be concluded that Ānanda's theory of *rasadhvani* joins the dramatic *rasa* s, as the objects of a poet's desire to express (*vivakṣā*), with a poet's *pratibhā*, as the source of his creative originality. This linkage forges an intrinsic connection between the poet's emotional state, a *bhāva* or a *rasa*, with a *rasa* -filled poem and with the sensitive audience in whom the aesthetic sentiment arises. Although Ānanda thoroughly clarifies and classifies *dhvani*-- that it is not a secondary meaning, that it is a meaning occurring after the literal meaning but different from it, that it may be primary or subordinate to the literal meaning--he does not explicitly treat relations between the poet and his work and with his readers. Such relations, implied by his theory of poetic communication, necessarily come into question. In Ānanda's example of Vālmīki's grief turning to poetry, what is the status of this emotion in relation to the *rasa* in the reader? How do *vibhāva* s, and so on, become a *rasa* ? These questions are left to Abhinava to work out in the *Locana* and the *Abhinavabhāratī*.

Chapter 5

The structure of Perception in Aesthetic Experience

Abhinavagupta's argumentation with a view to formulate a logical and rigorous structure of perception in aesthetic experience is directed to the Mīmāṃsaka Bhaṭṭanāyaka. The latter wrote a text, *Hṛdayadarpaṇa,* in which he forwarded his own aesthetic theory and refuted the concept of *rasadhvani* as the soul of poetry. This work is now lost, and what we know of it is through Abhinava's representation, who incorporates much of Bhaṭṭanāyaka's ideas in his own theory. It will be shown in this chapter that although Abhinava profits much from his opponent's exaplanation of the occurrence of *rasa* in one's mind or another's mind, his formulation of the perceptual structure, in dependence of the theory of suggestion in poetic language, is fundamentally different. Consequently, Abhinava's concept of *rasa*, the mode of its perception and the nature of aesthetic experience, differs from Bhaṭṭanāyaka's. For the Mīmāṃsaka, the aesthetic perception which is likened to *Brahmāsvādana* attains to a sublimity beyond any ordinary mode of perception. For Abhinava, however, although the *rasa* experience which is sublime and reposes in the soul is *alaukika*, it occurs through an ordinary mode of perception whose cooperating cause is intuition, *pratibhā*, but whose end, *rasa*, is *alaukika* because of its particular means, namely, the suggestive function of poetry and the theatrical accoutrements--costumes, makeup and headgear, and so on.

Bhaṭṭanāyaka's view considered

Bhaṭṭanāyaka, the Mīmāṃsaka, appears to have been a good Śaiva as well. We find Abhinava attributing a verse to him, describing the Lord as an artist who creates the world on the screen of his soul.[252] His descriptions of the *rasa*-filled poets and the proper reader, *adhikārin* of poetry, whose heart like a spotless mirror is receptive to its beauty, do not characterize a typical ritualist of whom it is said that the heart has dried up from the severity of textual hermeneutics. Of such Mīmāṃsakas, one may look for explanation in Sanderson's "Purity and power among the Brahmans of Kashmir," depicting a Tantric movement that was sweeping through the orthodox householders of Kashmir, a process which Abhinavagupta promoted in overcoding rituals with his Tantric deities and thereby internalizing Tantric metaphysics in practitioners.[253]

Because of the affinity in their theories, Abhinava argues at length and with much admiration against Nāyaka. The Mīmāṃsaka theory of language is closest to that of the Grammarians: both schools hold that words are eternal, and that their relation to their meanings is eternal. Both accept the supreme authority of the Vedas as a self-subsistent entity, a timeless archetype and absolute standard. For both the semantic capacity of words is

---

252 *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 5. Abhinava makes this citation from Nāyaka's *hṛdayadarpaṇa*, "*namas trailokyanirmāṇakavaye śambhave yataḥ/ pratikṣaṇaṃ jagannāṭyaprayogarasiko janaḥ.*" This appears to be, perhaps, a benedictory verse dedicated to Śiva, the poet of the creation of the three worlds because at every moment people are sentimentaltional (*rasika*) with the performance of the theater of the world."

253 Alexis Sanderson, "Purity and powr among the Brahmans of Kashmir," in *The Category of the Person*, Carrithers et al., eds., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

defined through their practical effects: the Mīmāṃsaka holds that a word is that by which the apprehender grasps the meaning.[254] Verbal cognition presuppposes an existing language structure in the mind and arises when there are auxiliary causes, i.e., a person who in uttering words manifests them phonologically.[255] Language understanding consists of a two-fold operation: an acoustic apprehension of sounds by the ear, and a meaningful understanding effected by contact of the mind with the soul.[256] The tradition of the *Vākyapadīya* is in the main in agreement on these points. Differences occur, however, over elements in transmission: the *Vākyapadīya* posits an ideal entity, the *sphoṭa* meaning-bearer, which in apprehension is a unity relative to which individual phonemes, once uttered and heard, are non-entities. This is not to say that phonemes relative to words and words relative to sentences are not material entities, but the theory stresses the distinction between the sequential and differentiated nature of sound-apprehension and the instantaneous, non-sequential and undifferentiated nature of semantic apprehension, which is an idea. The ontological gap is filled by the function of *pratibhā*, uniting the heterogeneous efficiencies and bridging the gap between manifold sounds and a unity of understanding.

Mīmāṃsakas, of both the Bhāṭṭa and Prābhākara schools, hold that the

---

254 A. B. Gajendragadkar and R. D. Karmarkar, trs., *The Arthasaṃgraha of Laugākṣī bhāskara* (Repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984), p. 4. "*yad yasmāc chabdān niyamataḥ pratīyate tat tasya vācyam*." "What is invariably understood from a certain (*yasmāt*) word is what is expressed by that [word]."

255 Mahāmahopādhyāya Gangānātha Jhā, *The Prābhākara School of Pūrva Mīmāṃsā* (Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), 1978 (1st ed., 1911), pp. 52-68.

256 Ibid, p. 52.

sequence of sounds in a word, and words in syntactical relation in a sentence, are direct causes of understanding. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa objects to *sphoṭa* on the ground of its being superfluous: if language engenders understanding through *śābdībhāvanā* and *ārthībhāvanā*, why posit an ideal entity between acoustic sounds and understanding?[257] The more sophisticated Prābhākara school holds that each word in a sentence is not semantically efficacious, and the meaning arising after words have been syntactically related in a sentence extends as far as the word leads.[258] But their theory would thus be *anyonyāśraya*, which is to say that the meaning of words will be derived from the sentence and the meaning of the sentence will be derived from words. Abhinava points out with a cutting wit: "Why, this Mīmāṃsaka might claim to be the descendant of his own great-grandson."[259]

These seemingly small differences widen in the application of language theories to poetics. When the Mīmāṃsakas argue that the function of poetic suggestion is merely *bhakti*, *lakṣaṇā*, and *guṇavṛtti*, they are adhering to the basic tenet that words are efficacious through the *śābdī*- and *ārthībhāvanā*, and that any other meanings cannot be derived directly from the words themselves but only through presumptive measures (*arthāpatti*) taken to prevent incomprehension or miscomprehension. If by the statement "*gaṅgāyāṃ ghoṣaḥ*" we understand a meaning at variance with the literal meaning, the basic functions of words are not to be changed;

[257] Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, *Ślokavārttika*. See n. 219, chapter 4.

[258] This amounts to the practical definition that a word is whatever is meant (conventionally) by it. See also n. 221, chapter 4.

[259] Ingalls et al, trs., *DhāL* 1.4b, p. 89.

it should rather be presumed that the understanding is derived from extrinsic and circumstantial factors, such as the speaker's intention (*tātparyaśakti*), or qualitative and relational types of transference from the literal to the understood meaning.

Perhaps due to this conservatism, Bhaṭṭanāyaka, in spite of his appreciation of aesthetic communication, accepts the existence of *rasa* but maintains that either *dhvani* does not exist, or even if it exists it is not the soul of poetry. His theory is that poetic language consists of three functions: *abhidhā*, *bhāvanā*, and *bhoga*. Nāyaka links his language theory to aesthetic perception in poetry and the theater, having posited a sentimental relation between the poet and the audience: the poet on the one hand is filled with *rasa*, and the audience partakes of this *rasa*, drinking it as a calf from the mother cow, *Sarasavatī*, unlike an ascetic who must cull his Brahma-bliss from subjecting himself to austerities.[260] Nāyaka's primary critique of former theories of *rasa* is that if according to Lollaṭa, *rasa* is *sthāyin* intensified by *vibhāva* s, and so on, or if *rasa* is an imitation of the actor's *sthāyin* which has been inferred through *vibhāva* s by the audience, there is the problem of one's mind and another's mind, i.e., the direct knowledge of one's own mental content and feelings in contrast to the indirect or inferred knowledge of other's feelings. How does one feel what another feels? The stance one takes toward one's own pains and pleasures is different from that toward others'.

Because in drama, a person in the audience is emotionally moved without being personally angered or saddened--in the same way perhaps that Vālmīki is moved by the sorrow of the curlew without suffering from the

---

260 Ingalls et al., trs., *DhāL* 1.6, p. 120.

grief--Nāyaka postulates a second stage of poetic language, *bhāvanā* or *bhāvakatvam*, which conjures up and universalizes aesthetic emotions. And in the third stage of poetic language, *bhoga*, a reader or spectator relishes within himself the bliss of *rasa*, transported beyond the world of ordinary experiences. According to Abhinava, Nāyaka has said that "*raso na pratīyate nodpadyate nābhivyajyate*."[261] "*Rasa* is neither perceived, produced, or revealed (i.e. manifested)." This statement seems to rule out any attempt to describe *rasa* as a mental event occurring in a person, and it is meant perhaps to stress the notion that *rasa* is an innate state of mind of a *sahṛdaya*. Since it is not *abhivyajyate*, i.e., it does not exist latently and become actually manifested, and it does not arise from causal factors (*utpadyate*), and since it is not perceived from external objects through the senses, this innate *rasa* is ever present and is realized (*bhāvyate*) purely in the soul when all stuporous obstructions have been cleared away by the proper dramatic stimuli, *vibhāva* s, and so on. To compare it to *brahmāsvādana* likens it to Sankara's ultimate realization "I am the tenth," a bliss realized by the removal of *avidyā*. Bharata has originally stated in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* that *rasa* is the primary object of the theater:

> In this connection, we will explain the *rasa* s now to begin with,
> Because but for a *rasa*, there is no purpose whatsoever.
> In this regard, *rasa* arises from a conjunction of *vibhāva*,
> *anubhāva*, and *vyabhicāribhāva*.[262]

---

261 *Abh*, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 275

262 *NS* 6. 32, Nagar ed., vol. 1, 271. "*tatra rasān eva tāvad ādau abhivyākyāmaḥ / na hi rasād ṛte kaś cid arthaḥ pravartate/ tatra vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicārisaṃyogād rasaniṣpattiḥ.*"

He describes the *bhāva* s later on in chapter seven:

> Now we will explain *bhāva* s. Here, one asks why they are called *bhāva* s: Is it because the *bhāva* s become, or is it because the *bhāva* s cause to be? It is answered that they are *bhāva* s in that, assumed (*upeta*) by speech, the body, and the mind, the *bhāva* s cause objects of poetry (*kāvyārtha*) to become.[263]

The Muni describes an *artha* in relation to *bhāva* s:

> That object (*yo 'rtho hi*) which is carried out by a *vibhāva,*
> but is known (*gamyate*) by *anubhāva* s which are verbal, bodily, and mental actings, that is called *bhāva* .
> And by mental acting (*sāttvikābhinaya*), whose means of stimuli are the speech, the body and color,
> in realizing (*bhāvayan*) the *bhāva* in the mind of the poet (*kaver antargatam*), [that object] is called *bhāva* .
> Because they bring into existence these *rasa* s which are composed by various [kinds of] acting,
> Therefore, these are to be known as *bhāva* s by practitioners of drama.[264]

Bharata is speaking of three separate things: a *bhāva* is so called through its relation with *vibhāva* and *anubhāva* , being carried out (or transported, *āhṛta*) by the former and known by the latter. This may be an emotional

---

263 *NŚ* ch. 7, introduction, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 337. "*bhāvān idānīṃ vyākhyāmaḥ. atrāha--bhāvā iti kasmāt. kiṃ bhavantīti bhāvāḥ kiṃ vā bhāvayantīti bhāvāḥ. ucyate--vāgaṅgasattvopetān kāvyārthān bhāvayantīti bhāvā iti.*"

264 *NŚ*. 7.1-3, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 340. "*vibhāvenāhṛto yo 'rtho hy anubhāvais tu gamyate/ vāgaṅgasattvābhinayaiḥ sa bhāva iti saṃjñitaḥ// vāgaṅgamukharāgeṇa sattvenābhinayena ca/ kaver antargataṃ bhāvaṃ bhāvayan bhāva ucyate// nānābhinayasaṃbaddhān bhāvayanti rasān imān/ yasmāt tasmād amī bhāvā vijñeyā nāṭyayoktṛbhiḥ.*"

state in general of a poet, actor, or an audience, or even the character. The second *bhāva* is so called because it realizes the poet's *bhāva*-- emotion or intention -- which sustains the whole piece, as discussed by Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha.[265] And in the third verse, it is so called because it realizes *rasa* s. According to Bharata, then, *bhāva* s exist in the poet, the actor, the audience, and probably in the character portrayed as well.

Nāyaka has termed the second stage of verbal operation in poetry *bhāvanā* or *bhāvakatvam* , with due regard for Bharata's sense of *bhāvayanti rasān iti bhāvāḥ* . But Nāyaka says that the *rasa* s are "not perceived, produced, or manifested." If the *rasa* which must exist in the audience is brought into being by *bhāva* without being effected by external factors, then *bhāvanā*, the second function of language which causes the realization of *rasa* , can be equated with *bhāva* .[266] Nāyaka makes *bhāvanā* synonymous with his invented *bhāvakatvam* . So, according to him, after literally denoting meanings, poetic language is poetic because it is *bhāvaka* ; through its universalizing function it possesses or engenders *bhāva* s which realize *rasa* . And within the category of poetic language Nāyaka incorporates and permits contextual and gestural factors--such as facial expressions, intonation, etc.--as a part of a verbal operation, to a much greater extent than Ānanda, who limits expressiveness of language to only two factors, literal and suggestive.[267] Although Ānanda does say that music

---

265 See chater 4, p. 107ff.

266 *Bhāvanā* interpreted in conventional meanings as mental conjuration (as in meditation, particularly Tantric meditation) or as the inherent power of words to cause understanding (literal and moral according to Mīmāṃsā theory of language, and aesthetic in this instance), is nothing new .

and gestures can suggest *rasa*.[268]

The operation of *bhāvanā*, possessing or engendering *bhāva*, consists in universalization (*sādhāraṇīkaraṇa*)--precisely to solve the problem of one's mind and another's mind (*svaparagatatatva*): if the *bhāva* s are solely in any one agent, they would have to be perceived, produced, or manifested in any of the other (among the poet, actor, audience, and perhaps the character). Poetic language de-objectifies: it removes the character of being an object of personal emotional perception from poetic objects, *kāvyārtha* s. It universalizes them: Sītā in poetry and drama is not a real individual or historical person, but poetically described. The poetic language modulates the reader's feelings away from normal emotional objectification. The poetic object, a *vibhāva* whose feelings are known by *anubhāva* (emotional affects), is realized in the reader not as a person, i.e., an object of direct perception or inference, but as and through the *bhāva* of the reader.

The argument is that if the audience views drama as a direct perception, the emotions engendered, love, anger, and so on, would interrupt the aesthetic enjoyment; but if he is indifferent (*taṭastha*), he would be completely unemotional.[269] The function of *bhāvanā* modulates these

---

267 This can be seen in Abhinava's discussion of Nāyaka's critique of Ānanda's first two examples of suggestion *DhāL* 1.4b, p. 831.4c, p. 98 (Ingalls et al., trs.): the housewives to the monk, and to the traveller. There, Nāyaka argues *dhvani* is not the soul of poetry because a *rasa* is realized in the audience not through suggestion but through (1) gesture and intonation, manipulation of the word 'I', (2) through the contextual knowledge of the monk's timidness and the lion's fierceness that there is an understanding of prohibition. Abhinava asks, if you are so keen on admitting these contextual cooperating factors, why are you so resistant to admitting suggestion with *pratibhā* as its cooperating cause?

268 *Dhā*, Ingalls et al, trs., 3.33e, 3.33i, 3.33n, pp. 555, 565-6, 585.

poles. Poetic language renders a specific cause (*asādhāraṇahetu* in logic) into a general or universal cause (*sādhāraṇahetu*), so that aesthetic emotions are neither personal nor impersonal. In this sense, the audience's emotional state is a kind of *bhāva,* like that of the poet's when he composes or the actor's when he acts. When Nāyaka says that *rasa* is neither perceived, produced or manifested, he views and solves the problem in the logical structure of perception: because the sensory objects that are *vibhāva* s, known through their *anubhāva* s, are such, it is impossible that the kind of aesthetic emotion we have could be the result of a direct perception. Nāyaka is delineating different ways that an ordinary and a poetic object are perceived. The language function of *bhāvakatvam* puts the audience in the *bhāva* of the play which in turn removes obstacles from each viewer's personal, emotional objectification, after which consciousness attains to the state of *rasa,* becoming a solid mass of aesthetic bliss.

Other Critics' views on the nature of *rasa*

Abhinava has given a short history of conceptions of of *rasa.*

> Lollaṭa and others have explained Bharatamuni's statement, " *vibhāvādibhiḥ saṃyogo 'rthāt sthāyinas tato rasaniṣpattiḥ* "[270] in the following way: *vibhāva* is the cause in the rise (*utpatti*) of a mental state in the nature of a *sthāyin,* and in this [rise] they do not want to say that *anubhāva* s are produced by *rasa.* Because [*anubhāva* s] ought not to be counted as the cause of *rasa,* but rather, among the very *bhāva* s, *anubhāva* s and *vyabhicārin* s are mental states, and even if they do not

269 *DhāL* 2.4, Ingalls et al., trs., p. 221; *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., p. 275. "*Bhaṭṭanāyakas tv āha--raso na pratīyate, notpadyate nābhivajyate...svagatatvaparagatatvādi ca pūrvavad vikalpyam.*"

270 *NŚ* 3.32, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 271.

> occur together with a *sthāyin,* he (Lollaṭa) wants to say they are in this instance of the nature of *vāsanā.* Even in the example, among the manifestors (*vyañjana*) and so on, the state of being one person's *vāsanā,* like the *sthāyin,* is another's state of amazement, like a *vyabhicārin.* Therefore, *rasa* is accumulated (intensified) by *vibhāva, anubhāva,* and so on, in the *sthāyin* alone. Let the *sthāyin* be unintensified: it belongs to both alike, in the object of imitation (Rāma, etc., in a primary way) and in the imitator, from the force of *anusaṃdhāna.*[271]

Abhinava adds that this is an old view found in Daṇḍin who has said that love becomes the Erotic (*rasa*), and anger in the ultimate stage becomes Fury. Lollaṭa, according to Abhinava, views the problem from the standpoint of psychology and understands that 'conjunction' (*saṃyoga*) means the conjunction of the *bhāva* s with the *sthāyin,* from which conjunction a *rasa* arises. Among these, all *bhāva* s except *vibhāva* s are mental states; although the *sthāyin* mental state is caused by the *vibhāva* s, emotional effects are not produced by *rasa* : the actor does not reach *rasa* in exhibiting emotional effects. But Lollaṭa also does not want to say that *anubhāva* s are causes of *rasa* (in the audience), and whether *anubhāva* s and *vyabhicārin* s occur together with *sthāyin* or not, they are mental states and, therefore, are trace impressions. The difference between *sthāyin,* and *vyabhicārin* is a matter of degree and locus, occurring in the character (Rāma) and the actor. *Sthāyin* is just the basic emotion which when intensified becomes *rasa,* from the force of *anusaṃdhāna,* an arrangement or artifice.[272] Lollaṭa assumes that the psychological processes occur in

---

271 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 271. "*atra bhaṭṭalollaṭaprabhṛtayas tāvad evaṃ vyācakhyuḥ... cānusandhānabalāt.--iti.*"

272 or it possibly means an intuitive synthesis in Abhinava's epistemology.

everyone: *bhāva* s (except the *vibhāva* s) are mental states, and *anubhāva* s and *vyabhicārin* s are *sthāyin* s under different circumstances. *Rasa* is the heightened form of a *sthāyin,* which is directly cognized by the spectator who thus possesses it through direct cognition.

Śaṅkuka[273] says that this is not so, as reported by Abhinava:

> Because without the use of *vibhāva* s and so on, it is impossible to perceive (*avagati*) a *sthāyin* because the middle term is absent. Because it would result that the *bhāva* s have already been defined since another definition would be pointless when one already exists. Because it would result in an endless, increasingly weak intermediate state. Because the Comic *rasa* will not have six parts, and there will be innumerable *rasa* s and *bhāva* s in the ten stages of love. Because we see the opposite [is true], namely that we know grief is severe at first and lessens in time, and we see that anger, zeal, and love diminish into its opposite, namely, nonenmity, fortitude, and habitual enjoyment (*sevā*). Therefore, the *sthāyin* is a *bhāva* in the form of an imitation of the *sthāyin* in the original [character] such as Rāma, etc. It is perceived through the force of a middle term to exist in the imitator (i.e. the actor) through its causes called *vibhāva,* its effects *anubhāva* s, and its cooperating [causes] called *vyabhicārin* s, which being produced with effort, although artificial are not thought to be so. *Rasa* is designated by another name exactly because it is an imitation.
>
> Indeed, the *vibhāva, anubhāva,* and *vyabhicāribhāva* are synthesized (*anusaṃdheya*) according to the poem, learning, and one's own simulation; a *sthāyin* is not synthesized even from the force of poetry. The words, as denotations, 'love", "grief," etc., turn love and grief, etc., into denoted objects. But they do not cause understanding as a verbal acting. Indeed, language is not verbal acting although verbal acting is carried out by it, in the same way that bodily acting is carried out by the limbs. Therefore,
>
> "Ripened of itself, even deep and wide and great,
> the ocean of grief is drunk up by the fire of the submarine fire."

273 A celebrated poet in his time, mentioned by Kalhaṇa in M. A. Stein, tr., *RT,* vol. 1, 4.704, p. 184. See ch. 4, n. 151.

Likewise,

"Struck dumb by grief he remains so, who is beseeched to move by friends whose cries are unsteady, struck by a vivid fear in their hearts."

In these verses, grief is not an object of acting but rather of denotation.

"The droplets from the mist of her tears, falling as she writes, show up like sweat that breaks out now on my body, from a touch of the palm of her hand."

But by such a statement as this denoting its own meaning, love in the form of happiness, in Udayana, a *sthāyībhāva,* is acted out but not spoken. Truly, the power to cause understanding which is acting is other than denotative. For this very reason the word *sthāyin,* being of a different category, was not mentioned in the *sūtra.* Therefore, the Erotic is love being imitated, and thus it is correct to say that the Erotic consists of it and arises from it.

"Of one running toward the lights of a gem and of a lamp,
thinking they are gem,
Even though the particular is a false knowledge, the particular
results in an effective action." (*Pramāṇavārttika* 2.57)[274]

And in this connection the perception in regard the actor is not that he is happy, nor that this is really Rāma, nor even that he is not happy, nor yet whether he is Rāma or not. It is not that this is someone like Rāma. But rather, this perception is different from perceptions that are correct, false, doubtful, or similar; but through the principle of a horse in a painting, the perception is that this is that Rāma who is happy. He [*Śaṅkuka*] says this:

"What one perceives in a flash is not a doubt, nor a truth, nor a
contradiction.
The insight (*dhī*), that he is this person and that he is not this one,
is an undiscriminated flood from a mixture of contradictory
awarenesses.
By what logic may a vivid burst of experience be questioned?"[275]

274 *The Pramāṇavārttikam of Ācārya Dharmakīrti,* with the *Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti* of Manorathanandin, ed. Dr. Ram Chandra Pandeya (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989) p. 76.

Śaṅkuka's theory is that the audience infers the *sthāyin* in the actor and in perceiving imitates it. It is called *rasa* because it is an imitation of the *sthāyin* in the actor. The audience directly cognizes the *vibhāva* and so on, and logically infers that the actor, as character, is in a certain emotional state. While the *vibhāva* s, etc., are created artificially, the permanent emotion is not created but rather it is the emotion of the original character that the actor is reproducing. What we perceive on stage, words and actions, are not real words and real actions; but they are acting, i.e., imitation carried out through words and actions. Śaṅkuka points out the inherent artifice of dramatic performances: acting is a make-belief that leads to an *arthakriyā*, namely, the insight (*dhī*) on the part of the audience that the actor is and is not the hero. This perception is a *pratibhā*, or a *dhī*, a sudden flash of insight, an indiscriminate flood of contradictory feelings, which cannot be analyzed by logic.[276]

---

[275] *Abh*, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 271-272. "*etann eti Śrīśaṅkukaḥ. Vibhāvādyayoge sthāyino... yuktyā paryanuyujyeta sphurannanubhavaḥ kayā// iti*"

[276] Abhinava does not mention any specific texts of Lollaṭa and Śaṅkuka as sources of these opinions. The rather sketchy report he gives of their views seems to be his own paraphrase, couched in his own philosophical language with terms such as *anusaṃdhāna* when he represents Lollaṭa as saying that the *sthāyin* belongs to both the original character who is imitated, and the actor who is the imitator, "*sthāyī bhavatv anupacitaḥ. sa cobhayor api. / mukhyayā vṛttyā rāmādau| anukārye 'nukartary api cānusandhānabalāt-- iti.*" (Nagar ed., p. 271) It is difficult to know exactly what this means, but it seems that *sthāyin* exists in everyone through the force of close inspection or suitable connection, or from the force of a mental synthesis by which the *sthāyin* in a person changes according to stimuli, the *vibhāva* s, etc. This seems to be the preferred explanation in view of Abhinava's following description of the relations between the *bhāva* s, with the *sthāyin* as the main one. (Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 281).

Abhinava's report of Śaṅkuka's position, likewise, is set in such a way that preludes what Abhinava will say later on about differences between a normal cognition and an aesthetic perception, by setting up the notion attributed to Śaṅkuka that an *arthakriyā* can be gained from a false perception. Abhinava is perhaps not fair to Śaṅkuka who in fact says, above, that a *dhī* is a flood of contradictory awareness that the actor is and is not Rāma, but Śaṅkuka is mainly treated by Abhinava as saying that the audience in fact actually believes that Rāma is the actor and can therefore infer the *sthāyin* from the actor's acting. But Abhinava is right in seeing that if Śaṅkuka thinks that the audience

Śaṅkuka's theory recalls the theory of *mimesis* the Greek dramatic tradition, where the artist is thought to imitate and reproduce ideal forms or reality of the gods' handiwork. The basis of an artistic reality consists in the reality of the original, which is reproduced and taken as a replication of a real thing by its perceiver. In the Indian case, the theory of imitation is taken to task and nipped in the bud by Abhinava and his drama teacher Tauta, who point out the logical and practical impossibilities of "imitation" in dramatic performance, either by the artist creating the character or by the audience perceiving the drama. If the actor's mental state is an imitation or reproduction, and his mental state is perceived as such, no *rasa* will arise. If the audience's knowledge of the actor's mental state is an inference, one cannot make a valid inference from a false middle term. Even if the audience could infer from an invalid middle term, i.e., the actor's appearance of being angry, acting, says Abhinava, is not a matter of taking up external characteristics of another person. As Abhinava says elsewhere,[277] emotional identification in an aesthetic context is not like an imitation of a beloved, i.e., as a person in love takes up the clothings or gestures of his/her idol. What Śaṅkuka describes as the audience's conviction of an identity between the imitated and imitator, is in fact not a cognition which can be judged true or false about a particular individual since the audience

---

has a flood of contradictory awarenesses, then it cannot make a valid inference on that basis. Abhinava, however, likes the concept of *dhī* and appropriates by using it as he gives instances of what an aesthetic perception is not. *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 34, "*teṣu na tattvena dhīḥ. na sādṛśyena yamalakavat... hastalāghavādimāyāvat.*"

277 *Abh* 6, Nagar, ed., vol. 1, p. 275. "*kāntaveṣānukāravaddhi na rāmaceṣṭitasyānukāraḥ etac ca prathamādhyāye 'pi darśitam asmābhiḥ*" "The imitation of Rāma is not like an imitation of a lover's garments. And I have shown this already in the first chapter."

entertains the belief in this identity about any other portrayer of the same character.

Śaṅkuka might say that Rāma is a universal form, but according to Abhinava this is not true because Rāma is an individual (because he has to have particular characteristics to be subject of poetry).[278] An audience does not personally become emotional toward the characters as portrayed by the actors; and if acting is a convincing imitation, and an aesthetic perception is direct or inferred, then it should be the *sthāyin* of the actor that is rendered an object of aesthetic perception, rather than the *vibhāva*. In that case, the audience would perceive the actor as a real person and infer his emotional state from its affects, rather than being emotionally stimulated by the actor as a *vibhāva* as described by Bharatamuni.

If Saṅkuka hopes to establish the theory of "imitation" by logic, Abhinava points out these logical flaws. If the actor imitates a mental state, love, of Rāma, the spectator perceiving it as an imitation will not have a *rasa*. If acting is arranged (*anusaṃdhīyate*) in a manner entirely artificial and extrinsic to the actor and is so perceived, no *rasa* will arise. Moreover, a valid inference cannot be gained from false middle terms; and if this

---

[278] *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 34. This is to say that we can identify with a character only as a particular person, with qualities, human feelings, and so on, even if we emotionally identify with him without having the emotions that he has. "*trailokyasya... tāvadviśeṣabuddhiḥ.*", "Of the three worlds. This has been said, Rāma, and so on, of this sort never descend to the path of knowledge. When they are described by scripture, then even if a knowledge of his particular [qualities] shines forth from a great statement, like the *Rāmāyaṇa,* even so because [particulars], by being in the present, culminate in an individuality (*svālakṣaṇya*) consisting in the capacity for a possible purposeful action, and this sort of knowledge of Rāma's particulars [from scripture] does not lead [to thinking] that they are in the present."

inference is a valid knowledge, then there would be a subsequent judgement whether the actor is really Rāma or not, but an audience, in fact, accepts equally any actor as Rāma. Finally, if acting renders *vibhāva* s, and so on fit to be directly perceived, then what the audience should really perceive is that the *sthāyin* is in the actor.[279]

These arguments amount to the question of believability in dramatic portrayal, from the perspective of the actor who portrays and the audience who ought to be convinced, or at least who is willing to be convinced. Śaṅkuka's theory of imitation is credible enough--that the actor's reproduction of Rāma is taken as real--until Abhinava points out that believability actually depends as much on the spectator's knowing that the actor is not Rāma as that he is. The spectator's perception cannot take up imitation simply as a direct cognition. Otherwise, he would either be too convinced and think this is really Rāma, or he would perceive the actor's gestures as artificial, which are therefore unable to convey a feeling.[280] Not

---

[279] *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 274. "*yac coktam rāmo 'yam ity asti pratipattiḥ... sāmājikānām pratipattiḥ.*"

[280] *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 273. "*atha naṭagatā cittavṛttir eva pratipannā satī ratyanukāraḥ śṛṅgāra ity ucyate... kṛtimāḥ santaḥ kim kṛtimatvena sāmājikaiḥ gṛhyante na vā. yadi gṛhyante tadā taiḥ katham rater avagatiḥ.*" "As to the statement that just the mental state of the actor having been perceived [by the audience] is an imitation of love, which is the Erotic [*rasa*]. There, too, it must be pondered, "What is it perceived as?" If love, etc., are the cause, an amorous glance, etc., the effect, fortitude, etc., the concomitant, and this mundane mental state being fit for perception in the form of a cause, an effect, and a concomitant, is understood as the actor's mental state by being of the same nature; well, then, the logic of the [of the audience's perception] being imitation of love, in the saying that it is perceived as love, is far off. [A rebuttal from Śaṅkuka's camp follows.] These *vibhāva* s, and so on, are real in the imitated [i.e., original character], but being a cause is not so in the imitator [i.e., the actor]. This is the remainder. Let it be so. However, inasmuch as these *vibhāva*, and so on, are really not

so, says Abhinava: the audience is willing to take any actor to be Rāma, on the one hand, and, on the other, it does not really believe that the actor is Rāma.[281] As Śaṅkuka himself says the audience's perception is a *dhī,* an undiscriminating flood of contradicting awarenesses, but a *dhī* is convincing enough to produce an imitative state of mind of *rasa* in the spectator. Abhinava differs in holding that the audience's conviction in the reality of the theater is never complete: they retain a detachment which is disbelief: "*teṣu na tattvena dhī.*" [282] "[No one] takes them to be real." And "*kin tu*

its [love's] cause, effect, and concomitant; simulated (*upakalpita*) by the force of poetry, learning, and so on, and being artificial, are they perceived by the audience as artificial, or not? If they are perceived [as artificial], then how do they convey [the feeling of] love?" Abhinava shows in this passage that if the audience merely perceives by direct cognition and inference the actor's mental state then (1) there is no difference between a dramatic and an ordinary state of mind, then there is no imitation on the part of the audience which would not be able to distinguish between a real emotion and a dramatic emotion; and (2) on the other hand, if the spectator perceives by direct cognition the *vibhāva*s, etc., which do not affect him/her emotionally, the perception would appear to him only that the actor is 'pretending,' or 'simulating.' Then, again, a dramatic action would seem fake and convey no feeling of love. In this case, the spectator would feel neither love nor the erotic sentiment.

281 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol., 1, p. 274, "*yac coktaṃ rāmo 'yam... naṭakāntare 'pi ca rāmo 'yam iti pratipattir asti.*" "As for [*Śaṅkuka*'s] statement that the perception is, 'This is Rāma,' that, too, if it is so determined at that time, in an absence of its negation by a sublator subsequently, why should it not be a true knowledge? Or, when there is a sublator, why is it not a false knowledge? In fact, even when a sublator does not arise, it should be just a false knowledge. Therefore, to say that [the perception, 'This is Rāma'] arises from a mixture of contradictory cognitions (*viruddhabuddhisaṃbhedād*) is incorrect. There is the perception, 'This is Rāma,' even in regard to other actors as well."

282 *Abh,* Nagar ed, vol. 1, p. 34. *NŚ* 1.107 of Bharata, "*naikāntato 'tra bhavatāṃ devānāṃ cānubhāvanam/ trailokayasyāsya sarvasya nāṭyaṃ bhāvānukīrtanam.*" Abhinava interprets the verse to make the distinction between *anubhāvanam*, in the sense of imitation, and *anukīrtanam* in the sense of re-creation. The context of the verse is that the demons are angry and concerned with their portrayal as the idea of the

sarvasya pratyakṣasākṣātkārakalpā tatra na dhīr udeti."[283] "But, rather, in this situation, an insight, like an immediate experience which is a direct perception, does not arise in everyone." This is to say that nobody in the audience thinks or believes that he is witnessing a scene in real life, like a direct cogition. Without this disbelief, the audience would think that a real event is happening. On the other hand, if the audience takes the play to be an imitation only, then no one will be emotional. The point being made here is that a direct cognition and inference alone cannot account for the aesthetic mode of perception, not even if the cognition is an insight that combines in it contradictory reports of true and false perceptions. The mind arranges and makes coherent percepts, not as true or false cognitions, but according to the goal toward which an experience is directed. Abhinava shows that an aesthetic experience cannot be a direct cognition that simply overlooks true and false judgements, but it must be an experience in which direct cognitions are arranged or apperceived differently from an ordinary experience in real life.

In this sense and from this deliberation, Abhinava comes to the conclusion that the cognition in the theater is always underlaid by a dialectic of belief and disbelief, which makes the *vibhāvādi* an extraordinary means

---

first play was conceived, and Brahmā is telling them that the theater portrays not only the gods and demons, but conditions of all in the three worlds. Abhinava comments, "*na devāsurāṇām ekāntenā 'nubhāvanam. nai 'va te 'nubhāvyante kena cit prakāreṇa. tathā hi teṣu na tattvena dhīḥ*" " Not only the gods and demons will be imitated. Indeed, they won't be imitated at all, because there is no conviction (*dhī*) that they are real. Abhinava then goes on to enumerate the ways in which an aesthetic perception is not a propositional judgement, or any other kind of cognition produced by ordinary means.

283 *Abh,* Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 35.

of knowledge. One cannot arrive at any propositional, true-or-false, judgemental cognition from seeing a dramatic performance. One does not perceive the *vibhāva* s in the way described by traditional logic and epistemology. And Abhinava therefore calls it *uparañjaka,* because it does not lead to a propositional or factual cognition, but it stimulates and influences the perceivers' emotional states. Because the aesthetic causes or stimuli are extraordinary, strange and unusual, the resulting perception consists in identification and distance--an absorption and a detachment. An aesthetic perception requires a that a spectator become emotionally entangled and at the same time perceive his emotions as objects to be savored.

While working out the problem of 'imitation,' Abhinava also comes upon fundamental differences between 'imitation' and 'imagination.' Imitations can be made of physical things and characteristics, but not of mental states. One can reproduce someone's mental state in one's own mind only by using one's own experiences. The psychology of the actor, probably taught to Abhinava by his drama teacher Tauta, is clearly described, with the conclusion that the actor who thinks he is reproducing Rāma actually has no idea of a real Rāma. The actor must "put himself in between" in order to recreate the character.[284]

Abhinava sets up this series of arguments which culminate in his own demolishing of Nāyaka's theory, as he says, " *taddūṣaṇam anuthānopahatam eva* ."[285] The conclusion is by now foregone because we see that Abhinava

---

284 *Abh,* Nagar ed, vol. 1, p. 274. "*na cā 'pi ...iti galito 'nukāryānukartṛbhāvaḥ* ."

285 *Abh,* Nagar, ed. p. 276.

has set down the definition of *rasa* not only in the first chapter of the *Abhinavabhāratī,* but also in the *Dhvanyālokalocana* as well. Śaṅkuka's theory of *rasa* as an *anukāra* of the *sthāyin* in the actor replaces Lollaṭa's intensification theory, namely that *rasa* is an intensified *sthāyin* which exists uniformly in everyone. Abhinava then proceeds to dismantle the 'imitation' theory and brings up Nāyaka's problem of *svagataparagatatva,* which has partly contributed to the refutation of Śaṅkuka's "imitation" theory. In the end, Abhinava also dismantles Nāyaka's version of *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa.* He produces his own 'corrected' view that *rasa* is a real perception, physically produced, and revealed, and that the process of universalization by which the audience has an emotional identification and distance is accomplished by active imagination. In this regard, not only the function of poetic language is at work, but also the entire psychic structure of the audience is brought into action.

The process of universalization, in Abhinava's version, encompasses the whole theater, which now, owing to a common imaginative enterprise of the poet, actor, and audience, is a single continuum of consciousness, like a *saṃvid.* The world of the theater is an independent reality, i.e., *alaukika,* not so much by its transcending the world of normal experiences as simply by being unlike any other mode of knowledge found in the ordinary world. Abhinava is at pains to show repeatedly what an aesthetic perception is not. He is able to cite numerous cases.[286] As to what it is, Abhinava is not

[286] See *Abh,* Nagar ed., p. 3. "*tatra nāṭyaṃ nāma laukikapadārthavyatiriktaṃ tadanukārapratibimbālekhyasādṛśyāropādhyavasāye... vastu rasasvabhāvam iti vakṣyāmaḥ*"; p. 34 "*na sādṛśyena yamalakavat. na bhrāntatvena rūpyasmṛtipūrvaka-śuktikarūpyavat... na yuktir acitatadābhāsatayābhastalāghavādimāyāvat.*"

always so precise, perhaps because Indian philosophy has not given much room for the validity of imaginative thought. The language and vocabulary for describing the imaginative process are for the most part those of Kashmir Śaiva philosophy, a fledgling among the established systems which have provided little means for philsophical treatment of the imagination as a cognitive process.

It seems that Abhinava borrows from his opponents a great deal and ends an argument by taking over the opponent's position. This habit can be seen from another perspective: the formulations of his problems as well as the answers depend on critical analysis of preceding opinions, and such opinions that he cites have been crucial to his thoughts. One might say that he 'learns' from his opponents, but his final opinions furnish new and critical insights that provide a more acute perception of the topic under discussion.

Is *rasa* "perceived, produced, and revealed"?

Abhinava presents Nāyaka's theory last because it resolves earlier theoretical problems and also poses the most crucial question: what kind of perception is *rasa*? Abhinava joins a psychological theory (after Lollaṭa and the old-fashioned views) with *dhvani*, to refute Nāyaka's statement that "*rasa* is not perceived, produced, and revealed." Abhinava's concept of *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* is in harmony with the theory of *dhvani*, and brings *rasa* into the realm of cognition. This cognition of an aesthetic nature is extraordinary because it is conditioned by a goal beyond the workaday purposefulness and because its means belong to the world of drama alone.

Bhaṭṭanāyaka has progressed beyond an aesthetic "naive realism" to

recognizing defects in the view that an aesthetic perception is a simple direct perception of purely poetic and dramatic elements. He also recognizes, in contradistinction to Lollaṭa's intensification theory, that *rasa* is a leap in experience: there is no gradual build-up to a high pitch of fervor, and thus *rasa* is not an ordinary or personal emotion. He has solved the problem of one's mind and another's mind with the second function of poetic language, whose *bhāvakatva* renders the *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* of aesthetic perceptions.

Bhaṭṭanāyaka's version of *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* does not make characters universal types as much as it modifies a spectator's emotional attitude: through its clear perfection and ornamentation, poetry generalizes feelings into *bhāva* s, poetic rather than personal emotions. Personal feelings which ordinarily exist in one or another person individually in the aesthetic mode become *bhāva* s. In traditional Indian theater today, after the dancer/actor reaches a technical perfection, he/she must seek equally to project the *bhāva*-- not his/her own personal feelings but the feelings required by plot, suitable to the harmony of the mood which governs every aspect--music, dancing, costume, intonation--of the piece, in the same way that an opera singer would seek to dramatize his/her arias after mastering the techniques.

Sādhāraṇīkaraṇa also solves the problem of the actor's imitation of the character: the emotions portrayed belong to neither. Abhinava says, "of a universal form, what is the meaning of similarity and with what?"[287] Bhaṭṭanāyaka, then, takes *bhoga* to be just pure enjoyment of emotions stripped of the constraints of being personal or directed to a specific object. He raises *rasa* to an entity neither perceived, produced, or manifested, excluding the possibility of its being a cognition, intensification, and

287 *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., p. 36. "*sādhāraṇarūpasya kaḥ kena sādṛśyārthaḥ*"

reproduction.

Likening the savoring of a *rasa, rasāsvādana,* to the mystical joy in Brahman, *brahmāsvādana* which is a solid mass of bliss, Nāyaka elevates aesthetic emotions to a transcendence beyond any means of perception. Nāyaka proposes, in effect, that the third function of language, *bhāvanā,* raises the relisher out of the ordinary world into transcendence, an experience of the pure *ātman* which is *Brahman.*

Having accepted many of Nāyaka's critical solutions to the problem of aesthetic perception, Abhinava's argument with Nāyaka over the phrase, "*rasa na pratīyate, nopadyate, na vyajyate.*" "*Rasa* is not perceived, produced or revealed." Abhinava says, "*tatra pūrvapakṣo 'yaṃ bhaṭṭalollaṭapakṣānabyugamād eva nābhyupagata iti taddūṣaṇam anuthānopahatam eva. pratītyādivyaktiriktaś ca saṃsāre ko bhoga iti na vidmaḥ.*[288] "In that connection, the opponent's view is not accepted simply because of non-acceptance of Bhaṭṭalollaṭa's view. So its fault is struck down without arising. We do not know what in the transient world is an enjoyment different from a perception?"[289]

---

[288] *Abh* 6, Nagar, ed., p. 276.

[289] This is a puzzling passage, particularly concerning the phrase "non-acceptance of Bhaṭṭalollaṭa's view." Who does not accept that view, Abhinava or Nāyaka? In any case, why does Abhinava bring in Lollaṭa's position at this point, of which we know through Abhinava's brief comment that he is the author of the 'intensification theory.' As reported, Lollaṭa's salient opinion is only that the *sthāyin,* permanent emotion, is intensified into a *rasa;* and that this condition is universal. Lollaṭa's mistake is to think that an aesthetic cognition is like any ordinary cognition. But he does make a valuable point that the *sthāyin*s basically exist in all people and become modified and intensified by various causes, a point that Abhinava incorporates while characteristically striking down the opponent's main view, i.e., that a *rasa* is an intensified *sthāyin,* and that a viewer's own *sthāyin* is heightened simply by watching a play.

In the *Locana,* of the *Dhvanyāloka* 2.4, we find Abhinava giving the same arguments against Bhaṭṭanāyaka, in much the same sequence, without mentioning Lollaṭa and Śaṅkuka. It is noteworthy that Abhinava attempts to establish that the scheme or structure of aesthetic experience is essentially the same in drama and poetry.[290] In the *Abhinavabhāratī,* he simply states that poetry and drama are the same, *kāvyañ ca nāṭyam.*[291] His arguments in the *Locana* seem not to have been concretized as yet, and he cites the opponents' points of argument without the striking and decisive refutation that one finds in the *Abhinavabhāratī.* But it is clear that Abhinava means to argue that *rasa* is perceived, produced, and manifested (or revealed by suggestion). He appropriates the notion of *vāsanā* from Sāṃkhya psychology and uses it as the basis of sympathetic responses to characters portrayed because, says he, all people have *vāsanā* s as the basis of their memory and experience.[292] At the same time, the audience must

290 "*upāyavallakṣaṇyam eva tāvad atra saraṇi.*" *DhāL,* VSS 97, p. 197.

291 Abh 6., Nagar ed., p. 288-289. "*etad upasaṃharati--tasmād iti. nāṭyāt samudāyarūpād rasāḥ. yadi vā nāṭyam eva rasāḥ. rasasamudāyo hi nāṭyam nāṭya eva ca rasāḥ, kāvye 'pi nāṭyāyamāna eva rasaḥ. kāvyārthaviṣaye hi pratyakṣakalpasaṃvedanodaye rasodaya.... tena nāṭya eva rasā na loka ityarthaḥ. kāvyañ ca nāṭyam eva.*" "He sums this up. From it: from drama in the form of a collocation are the *rasa* s. Or, if the *rasa* s are drama itself, [then] drama is a collocation of the *rasa* s. And the *rasa* s are in drama alone. A *rasa* is also in the poem being dramatically portrayed, for a *rasa* arises when an experience like a direct perception arises, whose scope is a poetic object... Therefore, the *rasa* s are in the theater alone, not in the world. This is the meaning. And poetry is just drama." Abhinava makes this point in a rather insistent manner.

292 "*rāmādicaritam tu na sarvasya hṛdayasaṃvādīti mahatsāhasam. citravāsanā-viśiṣṭatvāc cetasaḥ. yad āha tāsām anāditvam āśiṣo nityatvāt. jātideśakālavya-vahitānām apy ānantaryaṃ smṛtisaṃskārayor ekarūpatvāt ' iti. tena pratītis tāvad rasasya siddhā. Sā ca rasanārūpā pratītir utpadyate.*" *DhāL,* 2.4, VSS 97, p. 198-9. For

simultaneously entertain a belief and disbelief that the actor is the hero.[293] Having refuted Lollaṭa's theory that a *sthāyin* when in conjunction with the *vibhāva*, *anubhāva*, and *vyabhicāribhāva* is intensified into a *rasa* in the original hero and the actor, Abhinava nevertheless takes up the position that a permanent emotion is caused and intensified by these *bhāva* s in a

---

Abhinava's references to the *Yogasūtra*, see Ingalls et al, trs., n. 41, p. 231.

293 " *tasmād aniyatāvasthātmakaṃ sthāyinam uddiśya vibhāvānubhāvavybhicāribhiḥ saṃyujyamānair ayaṃ rāmaḥ sukhīti smṛtivilakṣaṇā sthāyini pratītigocaratayāsvādarūpā pratipattir anukartrālambanā nāṭyaikagāminī rasaḥ. sa ca na vyatiriktam ādhāram apekṣate. kiṃ tv anukāryābhinnābhimate nartake āsvādayitā sāmājika ity etāvanmātram adaḥ. tena nāṭya eva rasaḥ,nānukāryadiṣv iti ke cit*. *DhāL* 2.4, VSS 97, p. 195. The attribution of this passage seems intentionally ambiguous. Abhinava seems to begin the passage as his own opinion, and adds at the end *ke cid āhuḥ*. I think the reason for this is that Abhinava has been doing research and has collected various opinions on *rasa*, but has not quite made up his mind, which he did in the *Abhinavabhāratī*. The question whether the audience perceives the actor, as imitator, as the character, the imitator, or not, comes up in Śaṅkuka's theory of imitation by perception: the actor imitates the hero. This imitation is a *sthāyin* inferred--with the *vibhāva* as the cause, *anubhāva* as the effect, and the *vyabhicārin* s as the auxiliaries-- by the audience which in turn obtains *rasa*, which is an imitation of a *sthāyin*. (See *Abh*, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 271-2) " *tasmād hetubhir vibhāvākhyaiḥ kāryaiś cānubhāvātmabhiḥ sahacārirūpaiś ca vyabhicāribhiḥ prayatnārjitatayā kṛtrimair api tathānabhimanyamānair anukartṛsthatvena liṅgabalataḥ pratīyamānaḥ sthāyī bhāvo mukhyarāmādigatasthāyyanukaraṇarūpaḥ. anukaraṇarūpatvād eva nāmāntareṇa vyapadiṣṭo rasaḥ.* " It was Śaṅkuka who forwarded the idea that although this inference is based on a false middle term, the spectator nevertheless has the conviction that the hero and the actor are one and the same person by means of *dhī*, a *viruddhabuddhisambhedād avivecitasamplavaḥ*. The specator does not think at all about the actor, whether he is happy, or if he is Rāma, or if he is not happy, or whether he is Rāma or not, or that he is Rāma's look-alike. But rather the audience's perception is that that happy Rāma is this [actor]. Abhinava subsequently destroys this theory of imitation by perception--that there is any kind of imitation at all. But this point of Śaṅkuka's argument is well taken by Abhinava, namely that although the logic of perception is false, for the audience, the actor is Rāma.

mundane situation. To be contrasted with the *vibhāva* s as normal causes of real emotion, however, are the dramatic *vibhāva* s which are, not causes (*kāraṇa*), but stimuli (*uparañjaka*). Only when a spectator is so stimulated and his/her mind given freely to emotive imaginations, a permanent emotion reaches the state of a *rasa* as a savored rather than intensified experience.

In this way, Abhinava is able to pinpoint the difference between emotive causes in mundane emotions and emotive stimuli in aesthetic emotions, and can thus furnish an explanation of an aesthetic perception alternative to Śaṅkuka's theory that an imitative state of mind arises in the audience from direct cognitions and inferences. Abhinava states, on the contrary, that there is no imitation at all. Processes of direct cognition and inference call up trace impressions that are the same in normal and aesthetic responses. In the former, cognitive objects are causes producing direct emotional effects; in the latter, they are stimuli that evoke emotive imaginations.

Ānanda's thoughts on the nature of *rasa* as the soul of poetry has been treated in chapter four. Only relevant points concerning its aesthetic status will be emphasized here. The author of the *Dhvanyāloka* thinks of an aesthetic sentiment in the old-fashioned way of Daṇḍin and Lollaṭa: a *rasa*, an intensified state of the *sthāyin*, [294] is the soul of suggestion

294 Ingalls et al, trs., pp. 16-19, 113 n1. Ānanda indeed conceives of an emotional communication from the poet to the audience through poetry. On this matter, Ingalls writes, "Ānanda conceives this *rasa* to abide in the character invented by the poet or in the poet himself, as well as in the audience. As for the first: 'The speaker may be the poet or a character invented by the poet. If the latter, he may be devoid of *rasa* and *bhāva*, or he may be possessed of *rasa* and *bhāva*" (3.6g*A*). As for th poet himself, it is when he is under such a heightened state of emotion as *rasa* that he becomes capable

(*dhvani*). Thus, it is stated in *Dhā* 2.3:

> A *rasa, bhāva, rasābhāsa, bhāvābhāsa, bhāvapraśānti,* etc., appearing as a predominant element and [so] constituting the soul of *dhvani,* are assigned to the non-sequential type.

and in the *vṛtti:*

> For the suggested sense, such as a *rasa,* etc., is apprehended nearly at the same time as we apprehend the literal meaning. When it predominates, that is the soul of suggestion.[295]

By extension, *rasa,* being the soul of suggestion which is the soul of poetry, is the soul of poetry; and since the suggested meaning is perceived (*pratīyamāna*), by extension, *rasa* which is the soul of suggestion ought to be perceived in the same way. This perception is obviously not a sensory

---

of writing the suggestive poetry that will transfer this *rasa* to his hearers. The process is illustrated by the story of the first poet, Vālmīki who was so saddened by the wailing of the curlew bird who had lost its mate that Vālmīki's grief (*śoka,* the basic emotion) was transformed into the tragic *rasa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (*Dhv*. 1.5 *K* and *A*). The notion of Abhinava that Vālmīki ruminated on the determinants and consequents of the bird's bereavement and so developed his *rasa* in the scriptural way strikes me as an addition quite foreign to the view of Ānanda.

In most cases, of course, Ānanda's *rasa* is indeed produced in the scriptural way by the poetic use of determinants and consequents. The examples of this use, as in the verse of Amaru quoted above, are legion throughout the book. I wish to emphasize, however, that Ānanda's sense of *rasa* has none of the aesthetic removal, the impersonality and generalization, which we shall see Abhinava give to the term." Ingalls et al., trs., intro. p. 18-19. That Abhinava also thinks that this is Ānanda's view is shown in *Abh, NŚ* 6.38,"*kavir hi sāmājikatulya eva. tata evoktam 'śṛṅgārī cet kaviḥ' ity ānandācāryeṇa*" Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 292. The verse is from *Dhā* 3.42 comparing the poet to Prajāpati. See also chapter 4 of this dissertation.

295 *Dhā* 2.3 *K* and *vṛtti,* Ingalls et al., trs., p. 214.

one, for Ānanda describes it figuratively: in contrast to the perception of the body--sound and sense together--of poetry likened to the faultless limbs, the perception of the soul is like sensing the charm of a woman over and above her physical body and ornaments, which charm is nectar in the eye of the beholder. It is to be thought that a *rasa*, the soul of *dhvani*, is perceived in the same way without another extraordinary mental or linguistic function. In the fourth *uddyota*, Ānanda, who has prescribed the addition of a ninth *rasa* of peace to Bharata's set of eight, implies that the highest sublimity of poetry suggests *mokṣa*: poetry in its greatest moment leads us to intimations of the eternal and divine. By this, of course, he does not mean that the aesthetic experience itself leads to *mokṣa* or that it is mystical, but that the *rasa* s in themselves are extraordinary experiences, unlike the mundane experiences of ordinary life.[296]

In the saying that *rasa* is not perceived, produced, or manifested, Nāyaka takes it beyond the realm of ordinary to that of a mystical experience. Abhinava says no: *rasa* is a real experience because it is perceived, produced, and manifested (not as a potential actualized but as a mental phenomenon, *ābhāsa*), but it is far above any normal experience because of the difference in the means and cooperating cause, as well as the goal, of its arousal. The older theories of Lollaṭa and Śaṅkuka, by way of refutation, are cited so as to show Abhinava's formulation of the problems.

Explanations of the *rasa* s in the *Locana* confirm that of the *Abhinavabhāratī*, differing only in the manner in which the texts being commented allow discussions pertinent to the topics. In the *Locana*, *rasa* is

296 See Tubb, "Śāntarasa in the *Mahābhārata*."

discussed mainly from the perspective of language theories, and in the *Abhinavabhāratī* in the context of theatrical psychology. In both, Abhinava states repeatedly that the act of tasting (*rasanā*) is physically produced (*niṣpatti*) by the *vibhāva* s and so on. This act of tasting is not an operation of a valid means of knowledge (*pramāṇavyāpāra*) nor of a grammatical subject (*kārakavyāpāra*), but rather of a subjective feeling. An aesthetic sentiment is not an object of cognition. An aesthetic tasting may in the broadest sense be called a kind of cognition, but not an ordinary cognition because its means are different and its object, *rasa*, is also extraordinary. Abhinava explains,

> [Objection] Thus *rasa* would be an uncognizable object (*aprameya*). So it ought to be correct because, consisting solely of being tasted, it is not an object of cognition in nature. Then how is it that in the *sūtra*, [it is said] "production (*niṣpatti*)?" This [production] is not of a *rasa*, but rather of the tasting (*rasanā*) of which a *rasa* is the object. But by its 'production,' if it is said, 'production of a *rasa* which has that [tasting] as its basis,' there is no fault in that. And this tasting is not an operation of valid knowledge nor of grammatical case relations. In itself it is not unvalid (*aprāmāṇika*) because it is proven by one's own perception. Tasting is just awareness in form (*bodharūpa*), but only different from other worldly awarenesses because its means, such as the *vibhāva*, and so on, are different from worldly [means]. Therefore, because tasting is produced from the conjunction with the *vibhāva*, and so on, a *rasa* is an object beyond the world whose range [of perception] is this kind of tasting. This is the meaning of the *sūtra*.[297]

[297] *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., p. 283. "*nanv evaṃ raso 'prameyaḥ syād evam... rasa iti tātparyaṃ sūtrasya.*" In other words, a *rasa* is what Descartes calls a secondary quality, not existing in an empirical object but in a person's sensory experience and subjective judgement of it, like a sweet taste.

The hero: who is Rāma?

A question asked by Abhinava, which Nāyaka neglects as a result of his assumption that poetic language can simply generate *bhāva* s in the audience, is what is the nature of the original character portrayed; and if the actor imitates the hero, what sort of sensory perceptions and emotional experiences occur in a spectator who thereby relishes a *rasa*. First, in the consideration of the original hero, the theory of *rasadhvani* gives scope to greater vividness through its evocative language. It assumes that poetic language does not convey universals, nor does it universalize our emotional attitude. Just the opposite, *rasadhvani* conveys details of personal feelings in peripheral descriptions that suggest the essence of the matter. Take, for example, Rāma in a verse quoted in *Dhā* 2.1, in which the literal meaning is shifted (*arthāntarasaṅkramitavācya*):

> White herons circle against dark clouds
> that paint the sky with their wet lustre.
> Winds carry the small rain.
> The peacocks, friends of the clouds, cry out with joy.
> Let all this be: my heart his hard;
> I am Rāma and can bear it all.
> But Vaidehī, how will she live?
> Alas, my queen, alas, be brave![298]

Ānanda says, "In this verse the [suggestive] word [whose sense is shifted] is "Rāma." By this word we understand Rāma as developed into various

298 *Dhā* 2.1, Ingalls et al., trs., p. 204. VSS 97, p. 177.
"*snigdhaśyāmalakāntiliptaviyato velladbalākā ghanā/ vātāḥ śīkariṇaḥ payodasuhṛdām ānandakekāḥ kalāḥ/ kāmaṃ santu dṛḍhaṃ kaṭhorahṛdayo rāmo'smi sarvaṃ sahe/ vaidehī tu kathaṃ bhaviṣyati hahā hā devi dhīrā bhava//.*"

suggested qualities, not simply as the possessor of the name."[299] Abhinava glosses the verse in a wonderfully tender way that shows his thoughts of Rāma as a real person. The hero is overcome by feelings that are in sympathy with his lover who has shared so many experiences of love and separation in exile. Ingalls' translation conveys Abhinava's own vivid and empathetic visualization of the passage. I quote a long passage,

> ... the sky is covered by clouds of just such a brilliance. "Clouds that are *vellad-balākāḥ,* " that is, in which the herons, a species of white bird, are *vellat:* the word means "conspicuous" (*vijṛmbhamāna*), sc., because of the contrast [of their white bodies with the black clouds], and "flying about" (*calat*), sc., because of their joy [at being with their friends, the clouds]. And so the sky is painful to loook at [since it reminds one of days of love]. All the directions are also hard to bear. The use of the plural in "winds" shows that they blow from all directions; and by their releasing small drops of water it is suggested that they are blowing very gently [and thus linger over one's body and make one all the more love-sick]. Well then, perhaps Rāma should enter a cave somewhere and stay there for the duration of the rainy season. With this in mind, the poet says that the clouds have their friends (or helpers) among whom are the peacocks who produce out of joy sweet sounds that resemble the *ṣadja* note and become reminders of that whole unbearable scene of the clouds. On their own as well, these sounds are quite unbearable. This is what is meant. In this way Rāma, whose feeling of love in separation has been aroused by stimulating factors (*uddīpanavibhāva* s), knowing that these determinants of emotion (*vibhāva* s) will be shared [by Sītā], since love is based on mutual feeling, from here on in the poem conjures up his beloved in his heart. First he reports on himself: "Let this be." *Dṛdham* means "exceedingly." The word "hard-hearted" (*kaṭhora-hṛdaya*) gives scope to the particular suggestion that is achieved through the word Rāma and its literal sense.... Otherwise, how would the word Rāma not suggest other meanings connected with other qualities, e.g., the fact that he was born in the family of Daśaratha, that he was the object of

299 Ingalls et al., trs., p. 204.

Kausalyā's love, the deeds of his childhood, and the acquisition of Sītā? *Asmi* means: "I am the self-same person [who has undergone all these sorrows]." *Bhaviṣyati* expresses action in general, so the meaning is: What will she do? It can also be taken in the sense that "her very being is impossible" [i.e., she will kill herself, or die of a broken heart]. In this way by a succession of memory, name [sc., "Vaidehī"], and speculation [sc., "what will happen to her?"], he has conjured up his beloved from his heart into being present before him. To her, as her heart is about to break, he says with agitation, "Alas, my queen, alas, be brave!" The word "queen" suggests that fortitude will be the proper response.

By this: that is, by the word Rāma, the literal sense of which is not strictly useful here [to the idea intended]. The suggestions of other properties, which suggestions form the purpose [for shifting from the literal to the secondary meaning] are endless; for example, his banishment from the kingdom, etc. And since these suggestions are countless, they cannot be conveyed [simultaneously] by means of the denotative function of words. Even if these innumerable suggested properties were to be conveyed [by denotation] one by one, since they will not be had in single act of cognition, they will not be the source of a wondrous aesthetic experience and hence they will not give rise to great beauty. But if these properties are suggested, they will assume countless forms (*kiṃ kiṃ rūpaṃ na sahate*) because in the suggestion their separateness will not be clearly perceived. In this way they will become the source of a strikingly beautiful aesthetic pleasure that is analogous to the flavor of a wonderful drink, or cake, or sweet confection [where the individual ingredients cannot be separately tasted but yet add to the flavor of the final product]."[300]

This long passage illustrates the force of suggestive language in poetry on the imagination, of Vālmīki who wrote it, of Ānanda in citing it, of Abhinava in commenting on it, and of Ingalls who translates it. There is no "universalization" of emotion, in the sense that Nāyaka intends, which is to say that one would be pained if he/she perceived compassion in himself;

300 Ingalls et al, trs., p. 205-6.

that Sītā is not a *vibhāva* relative to oneself; that the stories of the gods are not suitable to be universal among humans; that no one has ever perceived Rāma so as to remember what he is like; that when people perceive Rāma through testimonies (i.e. scripture) and inference, and so on, it is not proper to say that they possess *rasa* s, as if [they have gained this experience] through direct perception.[301] Therefore, the emotional stance taken toward the hero and heroine can only be a generality, but this emotion is nevertheless aesthetically sublime when relished in the soul through the tri-partite functions of poetic language.

On the contrary, Abhinava and Ingalls, in commenting and translating, put themselves in the feelings of a real person, Rāma, in spite of the fact that neither has known what Rāma was like as a real person. Abhinava describes Rāma's feelings, as an individual's, through Abhinava's own visualization and imagination. In contrast, he says, no vivid feelings arise about Rāma described by the *mahāvākya* s of scripture which holds him up as a moral exemplar; but in drama and poetry, being is like a direct perception, we know from our own imagination and empathy such emotional accounts that make moral consequences of actions absolutely and brilliantly vivid in our hearts. It is in this way that drama and poetry penetrate the heart of a *sahṛdaya*.[302]

---

301 *Abh*, Nagar ed., p. 275. "*raso na pratīyate. notpadyate. nābhivyajyate. svagatatvena hi pratītau karuṇe duḥkhitvaṃ syāt. na ca sā pratītir yuktā. Sītāder avibhāvatvāt svakāntāsmṛtyasaṃvedanāt. devatādau sādhāraṇīkaraṇāyogyatvāt. samudralaṅghanāder asādhāraṇāt. na ca tadvato rāmasya smṛtiḥ. anupalabdhatvāt. na ca śabdānumānādibhyaḥ tatpratītau lokasya sarasatā prayuktā pratyakṣād iva.*"

302 *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 35, "*kāveyeṣv api hṛdaya eva tāvat sādhāraṇībhāvo vibhāvādīnāṃ jātaḥ. tatrāpi kathāmātre sādhāraṇībhāvaḥ sambhavati yady api tathāpi 'evaṃ ye kurvanti teṣām etad bhavati' iti*

Who is Rāma with whom everyone empathizes without having known him? The topic of the relation between a character and the actor seems to have been well researched by Abhinava, who mentions *nāṭyācārya* (s)[303] concerning this topic. If as Śaṅkuka says, he is the character imitated, Abhinava asks, what does it mean to imitate? If an actor simply follows someone's actions, he is miming or caricaturing. If the actor imitates Rāma "who weeps as I am weeping," he himself enters in between. The actor is 're-creating' Rāma through his own emotions and imaginative construction, and that involves *bhāva* s as states of mind, *cittavṛtti*.[304]

In the passage quoted above, Abhinava treats the poem like a drama: within the scene created by the *uddīpanavibhāva* s of clouds, the darkening

---

vākyavadrañjanātiśayābhāvān na cittavṛttir nirṇayagatā bhavati." "Even in poems, to begin with, the *vibhāva,* and so on, acquire a universal state in the heart itself. In the poems as well, even if universalization arises in the telling alone, even so, because such a statement as, "This happens to those who do thus," lacks an excellence of stimulation, the mind does not become convinced."

303 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 290. "*Srīśaṅkukas tv āha... loke prakṛtiḥ rasaṃ niṣpādayatīti. dvitīyapakṣō nāṭyācāryābhipretaśikṣānusāreṇa...*"

304 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 274. "*na cāpi naṭasyetthaṃ pratipattiḥ 'rāmaṃ taccittavṛttiṃ vānukaromi' iti. sadṛśakaraṇaṃ hi tāvad anukaraṇam anupalabdhaprakṛtinā na śakyaṃ kartum. atha paścātkaraṇam anukaraṇam tal loke 'py anukaraṇātmatātiprasaktā. atha na niyatasya kasyacid anukāraḥ api tūttamaprakṛteḥ śokam anukaroti tarhi keneti cintyam. na tāvac chokena tasya tadabhāvāt. na cāśrupātādinā śokasyānukāraḥ tadvailakṣaṇyād ityuktam. iyat tu syāt--uttamaprakṛter ye śokānubhāvāḥ tān anukaromīti. tatrāpi kasyottamaprakṛteḥ. yasya kasya cid iti cet so 'pi viśiṣṭatāṃ vinā kathaṃ buddhyāvaropayituṃ śakyaḥ. ya evaṃ roditīti cet svātmāpi madhye naṭasyānupraviṣṭa iti galito 'nukāryānukartṛbhāvaḥ. kiñca naṭaḥ śikṣāvaśāt svavibhāvasmaraṇāc cittavṛttisādhāraṇībhāvena hṛdayasaṃvādāt kevalam anubhāvān pradarśayan. kāvyam upacitakākuprabhṛtyupaskāreṇa paṭhaṃśceṣṭata ity etāvanmātre 'sya pratītir natv anukāraṃ vedayate.*"

light and brilliant clouds of a stormy sky, the birds fluttering about with their shrill cries, Rāma himself is emotionally affected and effected. Such a Rāma, confused and agitated by the sights, conjures up the feelings of Sītā and becomes all the more distraught. In reading the poem, no reader thinks that he/she is Rāma and feels saddened by the separation, although he/she must have personally experienced such a sadness. On the other hand, without a vivid perception that Rāma is really experiencing these pains of separation in this particular way, neither would a reader feel in himself the beauty and mood conveyed by the poem. The reader can get to the *rasa*, the emotional experience, only by feeling what Rāma feels, recreating not his own feelings but Rāma's feelings through his own. Here, again, there is no Rāma, no Sītā, no herons and rainclouds--just the words and the reader.

Determining the nature of a "dramatic character" is an important step leading to Abhinava's statement that drama, and poetry, is a re-telling, or a re-creation, *anukīrtana*, and not an imitation, *anukaraṇa*. This statement implies a categorical distinction between imaginative reconstruction and imitative reproduction, as well as a genre-distinction between scripture, historical narrative, and literature. These implications support what Abhinava seeks to confirm all along regarding *rasadhvani*, namely, that the suggestive function of language is the necessary and particular means to the end of literature, namely *rasa*. Events and personalities in scripture and history may be construed as 'paradigmatic' or 'factual,' and are to be 'acted after,' but not so in literature. It is a mistake in this case to think of Rāma as a historical or scriptural person. The reality of Rāma in literature depends always on being created, either through the *rasa*-filled poet who uses his

own experiences to portray the character,[305] or the actor who acts the role through the memory of his own emotional stimuli and making his mental states universal,[306] and the spectators who bring their own emotional and memory traces into re-creating the feelings of the characters.

The suggestive function of language alone, with its multivalent power to trigger a flood of images, operating together with the psychological substrata of consciousness, can arouse this sort of imaginative creations in the sympathetic audience. In this sense, indeed, the permanent emotions become *rasa* s (*sthāyino rasatvam āpnuvanti*): a basic emotion colored by those sparkling beads of transient emotions, re-constituted after the words of a poem now come to life in the actors, is the dish with its various spices, whose flavor is enjoyed by the *sahṛdaya*. Abhinava refutes Lollaṭa but takes note of the latter's essential idea that a *rasa* arises from the conjunction of the *vibhāva*, etc., with a permanent emotion.[307] In establishing his own argument for the *rasadhvani* against Bhaṭṭanāyaka's *bhāvanā*, to the effect that a *rasa* is perceived, produced, and revealed,

---

305 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 292. "*kavigatasādhāraṇībhūtasaṃvinmūlaśca kāvyapurassaro naṭavyāpāraḥ*" "The actor's action, preceded by poetry, is rooted in the universalized consciousness (*saṃvid*) in the poet." See also, p. 300. "*kavir hi laukikarativāsanānuviddhas tathā vibhāvādīn āharati nāṭyaṃ cānubhāvān yathā ratyāsvādaḥ śṛṅgāro bhavatīti*." "For the poet pierced by the trace impressions of worldly love brings about the *vibhāva*, and so on, the drama, and *anubhāva* s, so that the erotic, which is the relishing of love, comes into being."

306 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 274. "*kiñ ca śikṣāvaśāt svavibhāvasmaraṇāc cittavṛttisādhāraṇībhāvena hṛdayasaṃvādāt kevalam anubhāvān pradarśayan kāvyam upacitakākuprabhṛtyupaskāreṇa paṭhaṃś ceṣṭata ity etāvanmātre 'sya pratītir na tv anukāra vedayate.*"

307 *Abh* 6.23, Nagar ed., vol., 1, p. 271. "*vibhāvādibhiḥ saṃyogo 'rthāt sthāyinas tato rasaniṣpattiḥ.*"

Abhinava first demonstrates distinct psychological similarities and differences between real and aesthetic emotions.

Psychology of aesthetic experience

That Abhinava should entertain any part of Lollaṭa's view seems incongruous[308] until one reconsiders the psychological structure of the *bhāva* s prescribed by Bharata, with which Lollaṭa explains the *utpatti* of the *rasa*. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* 6.31-33 commence to explain how a *rasa* arises:

> In that connection we will explain the *rasa* s now to begin with,
> Because but for a *rasa*, there is no purpose whatsoever.
> In this regard, *rasa* arises from a conjunction of *vibhāva*, *anubhāva*, and *vyabhicāribhāva*.
>
> Just as gourmets, as they eat, savor the food provided with many spices that are added to (*yuta*) many ingredients,
>
> Just so, wise men mentally savor the permanent emotions which are connected with the dramatic portrayal of emotions (*bhāvābhinaya*). Therefore they are taught as "dramatic *rasa* s."[309]

In the prose section after verse 31, Bharata makes the well-known comparison between a gracious person's (*sumanā puruṣa*) relishing of food created by a mixture of various spices (*vyañjana*), to a gracious spectator's (*sumanā prekṣaka*) relishing of an aesthetic *rasa* in which the *vibhāva*,

---

308 Actually, it is not glaringly incongruous since we see that Abhinava cites these views because they are all somehow relevant to his own, and because he has devoted some thought as to how they might have helped to furnish a complete and correct explanation of the psychology of the aesthetic process.

309 *NŚ*, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 271, pp. 270-271.

anubhāva, and *vyabhicārin,* are combined. When asked what sort of thing is a *rasa,* Bharata is by no means clear. For example, in verse 6.33 he says that conoisseurs mentally savor *sthāyin* s which are connected with acting out the *bhāva* s (or which are tied together in acting out the *bhāva* s), and therefore they are remembered, or taught, as dramatic *rasa* s. A prose passage asks: "Here, does he say the enjoyment of *bhāva* s comes from the *rasa* s, or that of *rasa* s from the *bhāva* s?"[310] The answer is that only the latter statement is true, and the converse is false, "because it is seen that from the *bhāva* s there is an enjoyment of the *rasa* s, but not from the *rasa* s [is there an enjoyment of the *bhāva* s]"[311]

Verses 6.34-37 state in different ways that "in this way the *bhāva* s together with [kinds of] acting cause *rasa* s to come into being."[312] Verse 37 indicates mutual infuences between *rasa* s and *bhāva* s: "In this way, the *bhāva* s and the *rasa* s bring one another into being."[313] The introductory passage to the descriptive definitions of the *rasas* says,

> Now we will explain the enumeration of the characteristics of those things joined with consequents (*anubhāva*), causes (*vibhāva*), and transient emotions (*vyabhicārin*). And we will lead the permanent emotions up to becoming the *rasa* s,[314]

---

310 *Abh,* Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 290. " *atrāha kiṃ rasebhyo bhāvānām abhinirvṛttir utāho bhāvebhyo rasānām iti.* "

311 *NŚ* 6 intro. to 6.34-38, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 290, GOS 36, p. 293. " *dṛśyate hi bhāvebhyo rasānām abhinirvṛttir na tu rasebhya.* "

312 *NŚ* 6.35, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p 291. " *evaṃ bhāvā bhāvayanti rasān abhinayaiḥ saha.* "

313 *NŚ* 37, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 291. " *evaṃ bhāvā rasāṃś ca bhāvayanti parasparam.* "

314 *NŚ,* Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 297." *idānīm anubhāvavibhāvavyabhicārisaṃ-*

which indicates rather that the *sthāyībhāva* s are led to become *rasa* s. Another passage contains the same idea that *sthāyin* s reach the state of *rasa*, " *sthāyibhāvāḥ rasatvam āpnuvanti*. "[315]

This is the 'old' theory of intensification, in fact, that Daṇḍin knew and that Lollaṭa used. Abhinava partially accepts that psychologically a main, permanent emotion, is connected with the *bhāva* s, but this connection in itself is not an aesthetic process leading to a *rasa*. An aesthetic sentiment occurs by means of the suggestive language between the poet, actor, and audience. Bhaṭṭanāyaka does not admit the intensification process because, being a ritualist, he recognizes only a direct causal relation between sensory stimuli that are productive of knowledge through a mind-soul contact. Furthermore, Mīmāṃsakas do not admit psychological theories, particularly of the *vāsanā* s that are used by idealist philosophers to explain subjective factors in thought-production. In keeping with the language theory in which *śābdībhāvanā* effects a sentence meaning and *ārthībhāvanā* effects a higher meaning in the form of a desire to perform ritual actions, the poetic language theory says that upon understanding two levels of meaning, the audience is transformed into a higher state of consciousness through a verbal efficacy, the *bhāvakatva* that renders the stimuli--the well-ornamented *abhidhā* and dramatic portrayals--into universal elements of *bhāva* s.

Abhinava not only subscribes to theories of the various *bhāva* s but he makes the *sthāyin* of the sentiment of peace (*śāntarasa*) the self,

---

yuktānāṃ lakṣaṇanirdarśanāny abhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ. sthāyibhāvāṃś ca rasatvam upanesyāmaḥ,"

315 *NŚ* 7. 7, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 343.

ātman.[316] Commenting on the *Nāṭyaśāstra,* he follows closely the mutual influences of *bhāva* s and *rasa* s as described by Bharata and comes to the position that *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* can be explained only through a theory of suggestion. A communication by means of suggestion, in Abhinava's interpretation, implies a psychological structure of common types of emotions and trace impressions that makes the process of universalization possible. In this sense, when analyzing, after Bhaṭṭatauta, the theory that an actor imitates the *sthāyin* of the character, Abhinava says that it is impossible to imitate a specific emotion but the actor can only retell or re-create a common type from his own experiences and imagination.[317] In the same way Ānanda has stated in the fourth chapter of the *Dhvanyāloka* that the poet, although constrained by generic types of themes, must strive to create a vividly detailed, individual expressions out of his own imagination.

As mentioned above, Bharata (or, the *NŚ,* at any rate) seems to say that *bhāva* s are productive of *rasa* s, and not the reverse.[318] And when he says that *rasa* s arise from the conjunction of the *sthāyin* s with *vibhāva* s, *anubhāva* s, and *vyabhicāribhāva* s,[319] the first two are well known as

---

316 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 331. "*kas tarhy atra sthāyī...*" "*tenātmaiva jñānānandādiviśuddhadharmayogī parikalpitaviṣayoparāgarahito 'tra sthāyī*" "Therefore, in this [*rasa* of peace] the *sthāyin* devoid of tinges of constructed sense-objects, possessing pure qualities of knowledge, bliss, and so on, is just the self."

317 *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 35-36. "*na hi naṭo rāmasadṛśaṃ svātmanaḥ śokaṃ karoti. sarvathaiva tasya tatrābhāvāt... anubhāvāṃs tu karoti. kin tu sajātīyān eva na tu tatsadṛśān.*" "The actor does not effect his own grief, which is like Rāma's, because it [his own grief] is completely absent in him.... But he makes a [dramatic] emotional effect, but they are rather of the same generic type, but not like it [i.e., Rāma's grief]."

318 *NŚ* 6.46, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 297. *idānīm anubhāvavibhāvavyabhicāri-saṃyuktānāṃ lakṣaṇanirdeśanāny abhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ. sthāyibhāvāṃś ca rasatvam unpaneṣyāmaḥ,*"

ordinary conditions in the world and they follow after the ways of the world.[320] The *sthāyin*, *vyabhicārin*, and *sāttvika* s, altogether forty-nine in number, are mental states (*cittavṛtti*) which are causes of the manifestations of the poetic *rasas*.[321] The latter two *bhāva* s, according to Abhinava, are solely inert (*ekāntajaḍasvabhāvāḥ*) and ought not to be designated by the name *bhāva*.[322]

---

319 *NŚ* 6.32, Nagar, ed., vol. 1, p. 271. "*na hi rasād ṛte kaś cid arthaḥ pravartate. tatra vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicārisaṃyogād rasaniṣpattiḥ.*"

320 *NŚ* 7.6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 342, "*lokasvabhāvasaṃsiddhā lokayātrānugāminaḥ/ anubhāvā vibhāvāś ca jñeyās tv abhinaye budhaiḥ.*"

321 *NŚ* 7.6, vol. 1, p. 342. "*tatrāṣṭau bhāvāḥ sthāyinaḥ. trayastriṃśad-vyabhicāriṇaḥ. aṣṭau sāttvikā iti bhedāḥ. evam ete kāvyarasābhivyaktihetava ekonapañcāśadbhāvāḥ pratyavagantavyāḥ. ebhyaś ca sāmānyaguṇayogena rasā niṣpadyante.*" According to this passage, and Abhinava's comment (See n. 70 below), the *bhāva* s which Abhinava calls 'mental states' are the forty-nine included in three main divisions, *sthāyin, vyabhicārin,* and *sāttvika*. Abhinava, in the passage cited below (n. 70), following the *NŚ* in saying that the *vibhāva* s--such as the seasons and garlands--and *anubhāva* s--external [symptoms] such as tears--are known in and follow the ways of the world, says that these two *bhāva* s ought not to be termed *bhāva* s because they are absolutely insentient, i.e. not *cittavṛtti* s.

322 *Abh* 7, introduction, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 337. "*bhāvaśabdena tāvac cittavṛttiviśeṣā eva vivakṣitāḥ. tathā ca ekonapañcāśatā bhāvaiḥ ity ādau tān evopasaṃhariṣyati. teṣāṃ tu yogyatāvaśād yathāyogaṃ sthāyisaṃcāri-vibhāvānubhāvarūpatā saṃbhavanti. ye tv ete ṛtumālyādayo vibhāvā bāhyāś ca bāṣpaprabhṛtayo 'nubhāvā ekāntajaḍosvabhāvāḥ te na bhāvaśabdavyapadeśyāḥ.*" Abhinava most probably bases this opinion on the introductory prose passage of chapter seven, (Nagar ed., p. 341-342). "*tatra vibhāvānubāvau lokaprasiddhau. lokasvabāvānugatatvāc ca tayor lakṣaṇaṃ nocyate 'tiprasaṅganivṛtyartham. bhavati cātra ślokaḥ--lokasvabhāvasaṃsiddhā lokayātrānugāminaḥ/ anubhāvā vibhāvāś ca jñeyās tv abhinaye budhaiḥ//*" "Among them, the *vibhāva* s and *anubhāva* s are well known in the world, and because they conform to the nature of the world, their characteristics are not mentioned in order to check prolixity. And in this connection there is the verse, 'But the *anubhāva* s and *vibhāva* s oubht to be known by the wise as very well known in [their] nature in the world, conforming to the ways of the world." In

Among the forty-nine *bhāva* s-- *sthāyin, vyabhicārin,* and *sāttvika* which are states of mind (*cittavṛtti*)--the permanent emotion is likened to a king attended by the *vibhāva, anubhāva* and *vyabhicāribhāva* s, existing in it as qualities.[323] Just as men who are like others in having the same limbs become kings because they are noble, moral, learned, and discerning in deeds and the arts, just so, because their substratum (*āśraya*) is great, *sthāyin* s become *rasa* s. And the *vyabhicārin* s are the attendants of the king (*sthāyin*). Bharata speaks of the forty-nine *bhāva* s together as causes that manifest the poetic *rasa* s.[324] In another place, *NŚ* 6.38, Bharata uses still another metaphor to explain the relations between *rasa* s and *bhāva* s:

> Just as from a seed a tree should come into existence, a flower from the tree, and likewise a fruit [from the flower],
> Just so all *rasa* s are the root, and on them the *bhāva* s are arranged (*vyavasthitāḥ*)."[325]

---

this prose passage, the divisions of the *bhāva* s consist of eight *sthāyin* s, thirty-three *vyabhicārin* s, and eight *sāttvika* s, altogether comprising forty-nine *bhāvās* which are the causes of revealing the poetic *rasa* s. The *rasa* s are originated from these through the use of generic qualities. " *tatrāṣṭau bhāvāḥ sthāyinaḥ. trayatriṃśadvyabhicariṇaḥ. aṣṭau sāttvikā iti bhedāḥ. evam ete kāvyarasābhivyaktihetava ekonapañcāśadbhāvāḥ pratyavagantavyāḥ. ebhyaś ca sāmānyaguṇayogena rasā niṣpadyante.* "

323 *NŚ* 7, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 343, " *yathā hi samānalakṣaṇās tulyapāṇipādodaraśarīrāḥ samānāṅgapratyaṅgā api puruṣāḥ kulaśīlavidyākarmaśilpa-vicakṣaṇatvād rājatvam āpnuvanti tatraiva cānye 'lpabuddhayas teṣām evānucarā bhavanti tathā vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicāriṇaḥ sthāyibhāvān upāśritā bhavanti. bhāvāśrayatvāt svāmibhūtāḥ sthāyino bhāvāḥ. tadvat sthānīyapuruṣaguṇabhūtā anye bhāvās tān guṇatayāśrayante. sthāyibhāvā rasatvam āpnuvanti. parijanabhūtā vyabhicāriṇo bhāvāḥ.* "

324 *NŚ* 7.6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 342. " *evaṃ ete kāvyarasābhivyaktihetava ekonapañcāṣad bhāvāḥ pratyavagantavyāḥ. ebhyaś ca sāmānyaguṇayogena rasā niṣpadyate* " See n. 69 above.

325 *NŚ* 6.38, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 292. " *yathā bījād bhaved vṛkṣo vṛkṣāt puṣpaṃ*

Abhinava's comment is as follows:

> Just as a seed stands as the basis of the tree, just so are the *rasa* s; and they ought to be explained as a development (or growth) (*vyutpatti*) preceded by a joy rooted in it [a *rasa*], and so on. An actor's activity, preceded by poetry, is rooted in the universalized *saṃvid* in the poet. This *saṃvid* is in reality (*paramārthato*) *rasa.* And the idea that the audience, overcome by its [*rasa* 's] joy, perceives the *vibhāva,* and so on, through a subsequent analytical knowledge (*paścādapoddhāra-buddhyā*),[326] is for the benefit as regards the theater, poetry, and the insight of the audience. Thus, in this way, a *rasa* in the poet, standing in the place of a seed, is the root. For the poet is exactly equal to the audience. For this very reason, the teacher Ānandavardhana has said, "If a poet has the Erotic (*rasa*)...." (*Dhā* 3.42) In this sense, a flower, etc., stands for the activities of an actor, such as acting, etc., and the fruit stands for the audience's relishing of the *rasa* s. Therefore, everything really consists of *rasa.* "[327]

Abhinava interprets Ānanda as saying that in composing a literary work, if the poet possesses the aesthetic emotion, that *rasa* is conveyed to the audience who thus also becomes *rasika.* Ānanda views a *rasa* in the old-fashioned way, i.e., that an intensification of a *sthāyin* in bringing about the

---

phalaṃ yathā/ tathā mūlaṃ rasāḥ sarve tebhyo bhāvā vyavasthitāḥ//"

326 The term ' *apoddhārabuddhyā* " seems somewhat out of place and therefore its meaning difficult to determine. I venture that Abhinava is using Bhartṛhari's technical term to imply that the joy of *rasa* is, as Abhinava says, a solid, single mass of bliss. It is perceived as a whole in an intuition, like the sentence meaning, *vākyārtha*; and its analytical parts are later separated in a critical analysis, just as a sentence is later parsed in a grammatical analysis.

327 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 292. " *bījaṃ yathā vṛkṣamūlatvena sthita tathā rasāḥ...tena rasamayam eva viśvam.*

rasa in the poet and the character.[328] Lollaṭa's theory of intensification of the *sthāyin* proposes that the stimuli, *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhicāribhāva*, heighten the basic emotion into an aesthetic emotion, and that this condition occurs in the character and in the actor. The difference between a *rasa* and a *sthāyin* is a matter of degree, and by extension the spectator, in experiencing the *vibhāva*, etc., is emotionally keyed to a higher pitch of the *rasa*. According to the passage above, Abhinava also perceives that Ānanda is of the same opinion, namely that *rasa* is a heightened *sthāyin* and that it can exist in the poet, character, and the audience.[329] The passage shows that Abhinava interprets Ānanda's *Dhā* 3.42 (that a poet is god in his domain) to mean exactly that a poet's *rasa* is the seed and root that develops into the actor's acting and the audience's aesthetic sentiment: the poet, the actor, and the audience are the same because they are of the same emotive substance. This is also the identity he alludes to in *DhāL* 1.6, "*yad uktam asmadupādhyāyabhaṭṭatautena 'nāyakasya kaveḥ śrotuḥ samāno 'nubhavas tataḥ' iti*," as he explicates the meaning of *pratibhā*.

Sādhāraṇīkaraṇa

In proposing his own version of *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* and solving the problem of *svagataparagatatva* in a different way from Bhaṭṭanāyaka's, Abhinava derives a notion of aesthetic psychology from Śaiva philosophical notions of perceptions and knowledge, combined with Bharata's teachings concerning the art of the theater. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* itself does not consider

328 Ingalls points out that Bhaṭṭalollaṭa has added '*sthāyinas*' which some critics do not accept since *rasa* can only occur in the audience, but Ānanda did not limit *rasa* in this way. Ingalls et al., *Dhā*, trs., p. 16, n23.

329 Ingalls et al., *Dhā*, trs., introduction, p. 18.

psychological factors of *vāsanā*, memory, etc.,[330] but Abhinava liberally bases the structure of aesthtic perception on Sāṃkhya psychology. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* uses stock imageries in Sanskrit literature, such as of the king and his retinue or the seed and branches of the tree. Abhinava speaks of impressions deposited in endless lives that condition mental states, memory of one's own experiences, clear crystal or mirror of the mind, chains of effects of emotion; he makes personal observations about human nature in describing transitions of one mental state into another.[331]

In Abhinava's terms, basic emotions are a permanent part of each person's emotional life which necessarily colors his perceptions. The *Yogasūtra* describes consciousness as a crystal that is highly susceptible to taking up reflections of objects through sensory perceptions, which reflections are conditioned by innate trace-impressions in the psychic life. The yogic meditation is aimed toward a complete reduction of sensory

---

330 Although it makes a distinction between *vibhāva* and *anubhāva* which are material things and qualities in the external world, and *sthāyin*, *vyabhicārin*, and *sāttvika* which are *cittavṛtayaḥ*. See introduction, *NŚ* 7, on the *bhāva*s.

331 See, for example, *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 280, where Abhinava makes the observation that when they relish the consciousness which is a single mass of sorrow, women's hearts are reposed. Or, in the paragraph immediately following, noble characters are not given to so much laughter as the lowly types. In the paragraph below that (p. 281) Abhinava describes how one emotion is mixed with and give rise to another. The most pervasive emotion is sexual pleasure. The separation from the desired object gives rise to anger. When a person is angry but powerless, fear arises. As he is fearful but desiring still to win, he becomes amazed upon seeing what he should do and wants to flee. Abhinava sums up, "For there exists no living being in whom the trace impressions of these mental states are completely absent. Only any one person has more or less of any mental state." "*na hy etac cittavṛttivāsanāśūnyaḥ prāṇī bhavati. kevalaṃ kasya cit kācid adhikā cittavṛttiḥ kācid ūnā.*"

experiences in order for the meditator to confront and burn off the 'seed' traces of his inner life.[332] In the *Dhā* 2.4, while describing the nature of *rasa*, Abhinava quotes the *Yogasūtra*, "Latent impressions are endless because desire is eternal." "Though separated by birth, place and time, the latent impressions are uninterrupted because of the correspondence of impressions and memory."[333]

Abhinava thinks of trace impressions as constituents of emotions, and the latter in turn are patterned responses to kinds of causal experiences. These responses are not categorically distinct but overlap with and give rise to other emotions. They have been so divided because human feelings, based on their psychic trace impressions of past experiences, predictably arise in response to external causes. In a real cognitive experience, a creature is

---

332 *Pātañjalayogasūtrāṇi*, with the commentary of Vyāsa and the subcommentary of Vācaspatimiśra, Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series (ASS) 47 (Poona: Ānandāśrama Press, 1904), 3.55, p. 174. "*sattvapuruṣayoḥ śuddhisāmye kaivalyam iti*" "There isolation of the *puruṣa* from *sattva* in an equilibrium of purity." The *bhāṣya* says "For one whose seed of defilements have been burned off has no further any dependence on knowledge. Through the purity of the *sattva*, this power, born from concentration, and knowledge are attained. But ultimately, from knowledge unseeing ceases, and when this ceases there are no defilements further on. From an absence of defilement, there is an absence of the ripening of actions." "*na hi dagdhakleśabhījasya jñāne punar apekṣā kācid asti. sattvaśuddhidvāreṇaitatsamādhijam aiśvaryam jñānam copakrāntam. paramārthas tu jñānād adarśanam nivartate tasmin nivṛtte na santy uttare kleśāḥ. kleśābhāvāt karmavipākābhāvaḥ*"

333 *Dhā* 2.4L, Ingalls et al., trs., p. 225. See also notes 40, 41, p. 231. Ingalls provides the reference here of the *Yogasūtra* 4.10, 4.9. Ingalls in n41, p. 231, also gives an explanation of a line from Vyāsa's *Yogabhāṣya* (2.4), which Abhinava also uses attributing it to Patañjali, in *Abh*, Nagar ed., Vol. 1, p. 281, "*na hi caitra ekasyām striyāṃ rakta ity anyāsu viraktaḥ*, "the fact that Caitra is in love with one woman does not mean that he is out of love with others." This is not meant humorously, but is intended to show that beneath the particular emotions which we manifest there lies a latent capability of many others."

overcome by a variety of feelings[334] and reacts to them through the means of valid of knowledge, direct perception, inference, which means are a part of the normal cognitive processes. Knowledge and experiences in the past have occurred through these means and left behind trace impressions in his/her psyche. In an aesthetic experience, due to its different means and goal, a spectator's *sthāyin*, which normally overcomes him/her and through which he/she thinks and acts without reflection, becomes an object of perception.[335] Abhinava describes how such a *sthāyin* is influenced by flickering transient emotions: it is a string on which the beads of auxiliary feelings impart their colors, a configuration appearing in shifting hues of passing moods.[336]

The *sthāyin* becomes a *rasa* (*sthāyino rasatvam āpnuvanti*). In a real-life perception, the *sthāyin* is an individual's conscious mental state. But in an aesthetic situation the permanent emotion is again an object of the aesthetic perception. It becomes the object in the relishing of a *rasa* (*rasacarvaṇa*) in which many feelings are combined into a unique taste. Abhinava, therefore, speaks of the theater, the overall experience, as "an objectification of a particular, like an apperception," "*tenānuvyavasāyavat viśeṣaviṣayīkāryaṃ nāṭyam.*" [337] He repeats the same idea in the next paragraph, "*tasmād anuvyavasāyātmakaḥ kīrtanaṃ rūṣitavikalpa-*

[334] See nn. 292 and 331 above.

[335] *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 282-283. "*tatra lokavyavahāre kāryakāraṇasahacārātmakaliṅgadarśane... pānakarasāsvādo 'pi kiṃ guḍamaricādiṣu dṛṣṭa iti samānam etat.*"

[336] *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 281. "*tasmāt sthāyirūpacittavṛttisūtrasyūtā evāmī vyabhicāriṇaḥ... pratibhāsanta iti vyabhicāriṇa ucyante.*"

[337] *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 36.

saṃvedanaṃ nāṭyam. tadvedanavedyatvāt. na tv anukāraṇam."[338] This passage expressed in the language of the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* puts Abhinava's aesthetic theory in the framework of his general theory of knowledge.

The fundamental divergence between Bhaṭṭanāyaka's explanation of *rasāsvādana* and Abhinava's, despite the similarity of their vocabulary, is clearly shown by structural differences of the perception. In the former, language, with its *bhāvanā/ bhāvakatva* power, effects the experiential leap from ordinary perception to an aesthetic perception: the object in consciousness, *rasa,* is a perfected object (*siddharūpa*).[339] This awareness is not perceived through the senses, not physically produced by external causes, and not manifested or revealed. It is, like Brahman, that which has always existed and remains only to be known when illusions created by *avidyā* has been removed. Abhinava reports Bhaṭṭanāyaka's view in the following way,

---

338 *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 36.

339 Ingalls et al., trs., *DhāL* 2.4, n. 18, p. 229. "*Siddharūpa*: The term and its implications are taken from Vdānta philosophy. Śaṅkara argues that knowledge of Brahman cannot be learned or produced or manifested or developed in any way, for knowledge of Brahman is Brahman, which is not a *sādhya* (that which is to be produced) but a *siddha.* Brahman and Brahman-knowledge are eternally present, the appearances to the contrary being due to illusion. Just so Bhaṭṭanāyaka would take aesthetic enjoyment to be an eternal mode of being, which is not produced or manifested. In the last analysis he puts the relation between the aesthetic efficacy of the poem and the self-realization of the audience outside the relation of cause-effect which applies to the phenomenal world. It would be the same relation as that between the Upanishads and knowledge of Brahman. Abhinava in what follows will object to this high-flying mysticism."

> Bhaṭṭanāyaka, however, says, "I will call the theater that which has been accounted for by Brahma, that which has been made an account in the mentioning of various unsubstantial things wrought by nescience. For, just as [the theater] is mere imagination in essence and therefore has no single, abiding form; it suffers hundreds and thousands of imaginations at every moment; although [the theater] is different from dreams, etc.; all the more so (*suṣṭutarām*) being an account of the heart's apprehensions, constructed by a Brahman-like actor who does not depart from himself as the substratum, the exploits of Rāma and Rāvaṇa, etc., being unreal appear in any unreal and marvellous way whatsoever. Appearing even in that way, it becomes the means to human goals. Just so, this world is like that exactly. Consisting of an unfolding of unreal names and forms, it causes to arrive at the highest human goal by force of hearing and thinking, and so on." Thus, by hinting at the transcendent, supreme human goal, he must be implying the *rasa* of peace (*śāntarasa*).[340]

Bhaṭṭanāyaka makes an analogy that the theater, like the world, is an illusion. The theater is by this analogy a thing of the imagination, an illusion that the actor creates out of himself, in the same way that Brahman created the world. Even if they are false, the world and the theater are wonderful with all their ramifications of unreal names and forms; and they lead to the highest goal. This comparison illuminates Bhaṭṭanāyaka's conceptions of the function of *bhāvanā* and *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa*. The real world and drama are cognized in essentially the same way, through a direct perception which is

---

340 *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 5. "*Bhaṭṭanāyakas tu brahmaṇā paramātmanā yad udāhṛtam avidyāviracitanissārabhedagrahe yad udāharaṇīkṛtaṃ tan nāṭyaṃ tad vakṣyāmi. yathā hi kalpanāmātrasāraṃ tata evānavasthitaikarūpaṃ kṣaṇena kalpanāśatasahasrasahaṃ svapnādivilakṣaṇam api suṣṭutarāṃ hṛdayagrahanidānam atyaktasvālambanabrahmakalpanaṭoparacitaṃ rāmarāvaṇādiceṣṭitam asatyaṃ kuto 'py abhūtādbhutavṛttyā bhāti, tathābhāsamānam api ca pumarthopāyatām eti. tathā tādṛg eva viśvam idam asatyanāmarūpaprapañcātmakam atha ca śravaṇamananādivaśena paramapumarthaprāpakam iti lokottaraparamapuruṣārthasūcanena śāntarasopakṣepo 'yam bhaviṣyati.*"

not erroneous as a perception, but false because of its ontological status as an illusion.

Bhaṭṭanāyaka's use of the Vedānta language (as represented by Abhinava) of Ultimate Brahma and *avidyā* corroborates his sayings in the *Dhā* about a generic similarity between *rasāsvādana* and *Brahmāsvādana*. A state of consciousness called "a single mass of bliss" (*ekaghanānanda*) is Śaṅkara's description of the liberating knowledge, *prātibhajñāna*, a monistic realization freed from subjective-objective, differentiated, cognition of the world of multiplicity. The cause of this knowledge is only scripture, as Śaṅkara has argued in the beginning of his *Brahmasūtramahābhāṣyam* : Brahman is the source of scripture, and scripture is the cause of [our knowledge of] Brahman. Scriptural language enjoins rituals which bear results in the world, and the same scripture enjoins the seeking of Brahman who is without a second, *advitīya*, the pure mass of bliss which is to be attained through means other than rituals. Brahman is known by scripture and intuition, i.e. *sākṣātkāra* or one's own immediate experience, not as an object but as one's self, *ātman*.[341]

We consider Nāyaka's analogy of the *rasa* experience to Brahman-knowledge in the light of Śaṅkara's theology: the illusory world is likened to a drama performed by an actor, and the audience which realizes *rasa*, the intuitive and liberating knowledge, to *jīvātman* or individual souls. We further perceive in Nāyaka's poetics a parallel between scriptural and poetic language. Scriptural language has the power, *bhāvanā*, to enjoin ritual and

341 See Śaṅkara on knowing Brahman, *The Vedānta Sūtras with the Commentary of Śaṅkarācārya*, part 1, George Thibaut, tr., in Sacred Books of the East 34, Max Müller, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 1890, 1.1.1-4, pp. 4-47.

spiritual actions for those who seek *dharma* and *mokṣa* respectively; likewise, Nāyaka's poetic *bhāvanā* has the power to sublimate a literal expression (*abhidhā*) to a higher goal, i.e., a *rasa*. The inherent power of *śābdī-* and *ārthībhāvanā* in poetic as in scriptural language prompts the realizer to bring about what will come about.[342] The aesthetic *bhāvanā* prompts the effectuation of what will come about, namely, the *rasa*, through the theatrical *sādhya*, *sādhana*, and *itikartavyatā*. It universalizes the content of a poem/play with respect to the audience so that it is emotionally stirred while remaining distant. Removing this egoistic frame of mind is the sublimation instrumental to bringing about of what will come about, namely, the *rasa*.

In Mīmāṃsā terminology, the soul is the *bhoktṛ*, the experiencer or enjoyer of the fruits of ritual actions. A similar process is seen in Nāyaka's formulation of *bhoga*, which is not produced, perceived, or revealed by a cause-effected action. Just as Śaṅkara's scriptural language enjoins a knowledge transcending graduated stages effected by ritual actions and their results, Nāyaka's poetic language takes the audience beyond graduated stages of ordinary verbal cognitions that describe things in the world and actions to be accomplished. Sanderson describes the medieval Kashmiri Brāhmans as follows: because scripture and ritualization "determined them from without," Tantrism began to flourish among the orthodoxy, as a way of restoring a psychic life that had been severely constrained by cast and ritual

---

342 The *Arthasaṃgraha* puts it "*bhāvanā nāma bhavitur bhavanānukūlo bhāvayitur vyāpāraviśeṣaḥ.*" Gajendragadkar, A. B. and R. D. karmarkar, eds. and trs., *The Arthasaṃgraha of Laukākṣī Bhāskara*, (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass: repr. 1984, 1st ed. 1934), p. 4.

rules of purity and pollution.[343] In Nāyaka's theory, an aesthetic perception is determined by the power of language, context, intonations, dramatic paraphernalia, but nothing is said about the individual's agency. As it were, after such external instruments of perception have removed all obscurations and obstructions of the self-existing (*siddharūpa*) *rasa*, the *sahṛdaya*, who is an *adhikārin*, is overtaken by the inevitable relish which is about to come into being, a *bhavitṛ*.

Abhinava's version of *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa*. A student of Abhinava's philosophy wonders why he habitually expresses his ideas in other systems' vocabulary and as antitheses to their theses. Without any cogent answer, this thought moves one to observe that his notion of the perceptual structure of an aesthetic experience is marked by a uniqueness which perhaps could never have been conceived in another medieval Indian philosophical system. Kashmir Śaivas' theory of knowledge, beginning with Somānanda, grounds the notion of validity and its criteria in a psychological basis of a 'precognitive' impulse on the one hand and on the relativity of correctness depending on usage, *vyavahāra*, on the other. It gives a creditable valuation of constructed thought as neither absolutely nor provisionally real, without being an epistemological error and an ontological non-entity. It mediates the Brahmānic creed that what is created and liable to transformations cannot be real, and the Buddhist skepticism that what is constantly changing cannot be a unity describable as a self. The Śaiva notion of the self, i.e., the *ātman* which is *samvid*, challenges existing notions of reality and validity of

343 Alexis Sanderson, "Purity and Power Among the Brahmans of Kashmir," In *The Category of the Persons: Anthropological and Philosophical Perspectives*, Steven Lukes, et al., eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), entire.

cognition on both realist and idealist fronts. To the realists for whom the external world is real and existent, correctness consists in the correspondence between a cognitive knowledge and its object. Although Mīmāṃsakas hold that a cognition is valid in itself at the moment of cognition, it is understood that an error, a cognition sublated by a following cognition, is misrepresentation of the object through defects in the senses or circumstances.[344] To the idealists, correctness, which is not correspondence to empirical objects, has as criteria the soteriological notion of effectiveness or purposiveness: that which is correct leads to knowing and attaining the ultimate reality.

For Śaivas, knowledge is equally based on sense percepts of external objects as on a subjective and conceptual construction. On the one hand, a person perceives in his cognition a real and stable thing governed by physical laws (*niyati*), and, on the other hand, this cognition is a subjective manifestation. Validity of knowledge depends on the continuity between a cognition and the purpose effected by it in this world, which, according to Abhinava, is real because it is a place where human actions come to pass. Otherwise, he says, we can call nothing else 'real.'[345] Valid knowledge,

---

[344] Gaṅgānātha Jha, tr., *Ślokavārttika* 5.207, 208, 211l, p. 173. "Sometimes it happens that Cognitions appear in an incorrect form; but this is due to certain discrepancies in the cognitions themselves." 208. "For "Cognition" too cannot attain to its character, unless it is possesseed by an external object." 211. "It is for this reason that the Cognition to the contrary (of any misconceived Cognition) gives rise to such a reasoning as that 'though the object really exists in another form, yet this (false) form is imposed upon it by the mind (or Cognition) (under the influences of a certain delusion.'"

[345] Arguing for the reality of verbally constructed, relational concepts which are the glue of thought-constructs, he says, "Thus even unperceived, other manifestations as the forms of universals, relations, and so on, enter into this manifestation itself.

indeed, is predicated by being newly manifested by the knower.[346]

What Abhinava assails in Śaṅkuka's argument of imitation by perception largely destroys the false logic of perception, in which the traditional application of inferential middle term, and so on, seems to work until the experiential components of perception and imitation are closely analyzed. Abhinava's talk of intensification (*upacaya*) and coloration (*uparañjaka*) of a basic emotional states affirms the notion that an experience, which is subjective, is also a valid and real response to the world. This position pointedly subverts Bhaṭṭanāyaka's denial of a substantive link between a worldly provisional reality and the ultimate *Brahmātman* reality transferred into the theater, so that the progress from seeing a play and relishing a *rasa* is a leap in experience, from illusion to reality.

Abhinava's *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* comprises the unique reality of the theater created by a common imagination, and so he can say that its culmination, the *rasa,* is perceived, produced and revealed. Being universal means that an aesthetic perception is a re-creation, and drama an object created (*viṣayīkārya*) in which each part uniquely recreates the whole, all being of the same type (*sajātīya*), rather than alike (*sadṛśya*). The theater exists

---

Otherwise no transaction of the ordinary world is possible, and, thus, if this ordinary world which is beneficial to humans in all times, places, and aspects, were unreal, we know of nothing else that is real. So one should not err in of thinking [these concepts] are errors." "*evaṃ ca ābhāsātmani asmin asaṃvedyam api... iti na atra bhrāntiḥ iti bhramitavyam.*" IPV 2.2.7, vol. 2, p. 63.

346 *IPV* 2.2.3., vol. 2, p. 138. "*yataḥ pramāṇaṃ nāma navābhāsarūpaṃ pramātari pramitilakṣaṇāṃ viśrāntiṃ vidadhat pramāṇaṃ bhavati, pramātā cāvicchinnābhāsaḥ sarvāś ca pramitīḥ svātmani antarmukharūpe bhajate.*" "Because a valid knowledge in the form of a new manifestation becomes valid in creating a repose characterized by valid knowledge (i.e. the content) in the cognizer, and the cognizer who is continuously manifested enjoys all knowledges within himself inwardly."

only in the present: so long as each spectator echoes the poet's imagination, he recreates drama in himself just as the actor recreates the hero through his own psychic and emotional experiences. In this sense Abhinava speaks of a *rasa* as extraordinary, *alaukika*, which does not exist in the ordinary world and which lasts only as long as its stimuli persist. The theater, as a world of the imagination, creates its own reality apart from the ordinary and absolute worlds. Through its proper means and goal, the theater is a unity as constructed by an experience shared by the poet, the actor, and the audience.

Abhinava speaks of *sādhāraṇīkāraṇa* in two parallel passages in *Abh*, chapters one and six. In chapter one, he begins with the thought that an aesthetic experience depends on a mental conditioning that orients direct cognitions to an aesthetic mode. Conditioning is evinced in the spectator's intention, not to do something real, but to enjoy him/herself in being one with others. Such a consent underlies the cancellation of true-and-false judgements in ordinary propositional cognitions. This cancellation removes the time-space framework from dramatic actions, unbridles the imagination and makes the theater a single timeless and spaceless continuum. Such initial priming turns the spectator into one whose heart is spotless mirror--not preoccupied with worldly matters and not cut off from other minds and hearts. Abhinava says,

> The mind, to begin with, becomes submerged in poetry, whose body consists of words and meanings that are delightful because of qualities and ornaments, whose life is an extraordinary *rasa*, by force of the hearts' sympathy. However, for everyone an insight does not arise

> toward it (*tatra*) like an immediate experience which is a direct perception. But in the theater, because he has no such intention as, "Today I must do something real," and from an impression of the intention that, "I will join in the lofty, extraordinary sights and sounds whose pervasive relishing (*virasana*) will end in an essence of joy common to the whole assembly (*sarvaparṣatsādhāraṇa*), his heart becomes like a spotless mirror as his worldly being (*sāṃsārikabhāva*) is dazzled in the relish of pleasant songs and dances. He identifies with the joy and grief that burst forth, to be conveyed in watching the dramatic actions. By force of hearing a recitation when another actor enters, the determination of the sense object as Rāma, Rāvaṇa and so on arises; the realm of objectification into knowledge and object of knowledge such as correct, false, doubt, possibility, and so on, is unembraced by an entrance (*āveśa*) of particulars of time and space. [Each spectator in the audience] has the trace impressions from determining that this is the said Rāma, conforming to and indicated by the trace impressions of experiences of love and so on and pleasant things--songs and dances--that accompany [the actor as Rāma], with the unfolding (*anuvṛtti*) of his [the actor as Rāma] trace impressions as the cause. For five or six days, his thought is full of wonder because his own self has been absorbed in the midst of Rāma's exploits...."[347]

In *Abh,* chapter six, Abhinava expresses the same idea, having prefaced the passage with the remark that a qualified person after hearing scriptural words, and poetic words, perceives subsequently a higher meaning:

> A qualified person, in the case of poetry, is a person whose heart is full of spotless intuition (*vimalapratibhāśālin*). To him who understands sentence meanings from such sentences, "gracefully bending his neck...." "Also, Umā of the black curls...." "But, Śiva, somewhat...," now, there arises a perception of the nature of an immediate mental presentation, whose divisions of time designated by respective passages are blocked (*apahastita*). In this perception, the fawn that appears, because it does

[347] *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., p. 35. "*kāvye tu guṇālaṃkāramanohāraśabdārthaśarīre... tathā paśyan pratyekaṃ sāmājika.*"

> not have the form of a particular, is "fearful." Because the fright is unreal, that fear is ultimately just fear, not embraced by time and space. [This fear] is different from such notions as, "I am fearful, he is fearful--is this an enemy, a friend, or a neutral person?" which have many obstructions because other awarenesses of loss, and others, created by joy and sorrow, necessarily arise. The Fearful *rasa* is apprehended as an unobstructed (*nirvighna*) perception, entering into the heart as if it were a direct perception, turning about as if it were happening before the eyes. In this kind of fear, the self is not absolutely suppressed [i.e. hidden], nor is it described by particular [images]. And so for another (*rasa*).
>
> For this very reason, universality (*sādhārāṇya*) is not at all limited, but, rather, it spreads out as in the perception of pervasion of smoke by fire, or, for that matter (*eva*) of trembling by fear. In this case, when they are acting out [the scene in] immediate perception, the nourishing collocation, the actors, etc., when from the force of mutual opposition, causes of restriction (*niyamahetu*) such as time, space, cognizers, and so on--factual realities cast in poems--have disappeared, in that [collocation of actors, etc.] this very universal condition (*sādhāraṇībhāva*) thrives exceedingly. For this reason, as the perception of the whole audience is a single compact mass, *rasa* thrives all the more, from sympathetic communication among all [spectators] whose minds have been made varied (*citrīkṛta*) by beginningless trace impressions. And that unobstructed full consciousness (*avighnā saṃvit*) is *camatkāra*.[348]

The world of the theater is unencumbered by causes of restriction such as time, space, cognizers, and so on; it is pervaded by the "universal condition" thriving from the force of a common imagination which, through each person's own trace impressions, is focused on recreating the drama. Such a reality, the construct of a collective imagination, is possible because consciousness is a free and independent manifestor. In fact, the thrust of Abhinava's refutation of Nāyaka's concept of the *rasa*-- that it is not

---

[348] *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., p. 278. "*adhikārī cātra vimalapratibhānaśālihṛdayaḥ... sā cāvighnā saṃvit.*"

perceived, produced, and revealed -- is aimed toward establishing that an aesthetic experience is a real perception. The *vāsanā* s, basic components of mental states, underly emotive and imaginative responses to sensory perceptions in real life as in the theater. In real life, perceptions of a garden, an amorous man or woman, sidelong glances, and so on, combined with an inference based on past experiences of having been in love, engender an emotion of love, *rati,* which is just the person's state of mind. The goal of a person in this situation is to obtain the desired object of love.

In the theater, as we have seen above, Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Abhinava each has a different explanation for the process of detaching oneself from one's own emotions. Abhinava's version of the *sādhāraṇībhāva* creates a special unity in the theatrical space as described above. The goal which is present in the spectator's intention as he/she enters this space, which enchants the audience with its music, dancing, costumes, and so on, is to enjoy oneself and to relish the *rasa* in common with others. This particular intention removes the ordinary time-space framework from the imaginative constructs and erases the egoistic boundaries of the self and others, as the spectators are commonly focused on sharing an imaginative experience of the same kind. After ordinary emotions are thus universalized, they can culminate in a *rasa* only in being an object of relishing. It is the relishing and savoring of one's own varied, emotive colorings that Abhinava calls apperception, which is the theater: "*anuvyavasāyātmakaṃ kīrtanaṃ rūṣitavikalpasaṃvedanaṃ nāṭyam*" "The theater is a [re]creation in the nature of an apperception, namely, the perception of colored mental constructs."[349]

[349] *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., p. 36. "*tenānuvyavasāyavat viśeṣaviṣayīkāryaṃ nāṭyam...tasmād anuvyavasāyātmakaṃ kīrtanaṃ rūṣitavikalpasaṃvedanaṃ nāṭyam.*

Anuvyavasāya

Abhinava describes the process by which a spectator becomes emotionally identified as follows. The spectator's state of mind conforms to that of the character, through the acting, dancing, singing, and so on, of the actor. The spectator does not believe the actor is Rāma but suspends the belief that he is not Rāma. Thus, even if the hero Rāma is not the real person on stage, Rāma's mental states are re-told through the trace impressions and mental states of the actor. For this reason, the actor is not a direct cause of emotions, but a dramatic cause of emotion, i.e., a *vibhāva,* which is a stimulus, *uparañjaka.* The dramatic, inner states of mind are communicated through the external characteristics of *anubhāva.* These *vibhāva* and *anubhāva* cause the trace-impressions of the spectator to conform to those of the heroes. Abhinava describes further,

> For five or six days, his thought is full of wonder because his own self has been absorbed in the midst of Rāma's exploits, seeing the world in that way [*tathā* as Rāma would see it] through himself without a reflection on temporal and spatial particulars, [only with the awareness] that this happens to those who do such. This world is delivered up in the manner of something devoured, being of the same type as a full consciousness (*saṃvijjātīyam eva*). By force of experiencing a *rasa* through impressions of songs and dances accompanying the relishing of a *rasa,* which is like a lover who is the life-breath of the stimuli of a particular consciousness. From this alone, he experiences this world which, even as it is pierced deep in the heart by hundreds of arrows, is not enjoyed as something stale. Exactly because of the way that the desire to attain various good things and to abandon evil things are always strung

---

tad vedanavedyatvāt na tv anukaraṇarūpam. "

> together, he practices the good and forsakes evil. Now, because a perception of the means has been acquired, this re-creation (*anukīrtana*), a particular [kind of] apperception (*anuvyavasāya*), is another synonym of the theater.[350]

The point of the theater being a re-telling, not an imitation, which is an *anuvyavasāya* is so important that Abhinava repeats it several times, with a specific references to his teacher Tauta's objections to Śaṅkuka's theory of imitation. The term 'apperception' indicates an underlying perception of a direct perception. As he has described previously, the emotional conditions of Rāma-actor stimulates the audience into like emotions. The stimuli do not directly cause, but evoke the trace impressions in sympathetic, receptive audience to conform and form the emotions of each spectator. In this case, the audience is like the actor, who does not imitate but allows his own *saṃskāra* to shape a mental state of the same generic type as the character's as described by the poet in the poem. The fact that the audience is able to savor and enjoy this emotional experience with an aesthetic distance implies an apperceiver who enjoys the pure flavors of feelings. In a long passage, Abhinava explains why the theater is an *anuvyavasāya,*

> Therefore, the theater, like an apperception, is that in which a particular is to be made an object. Accordingly, [at first] there is a belief (*abhimāna*) of directly perceiving a particular actor, Caitra or Maitra, at that time and place, wearing particular costumes, and so on; and without using any particular thing, this belief proceeds contrary to a direct perception: from the use of the word Rāma, which literally expresses the noble deeds because its meaning is well known, and which is an

350 *Abh* 1., Nagar ed., p. 35. "*pañcaṣair divasaiḥ sacamatkāratadīyacaritamadhya... tad idam anumīrtanam anuvyavasāyaviśeṣo nāṭyāparaparyāyaḥ.*"

apperception (*anuvyavasāya*) because it denies that the [name Rāma] is a mere supposition, drama, being like a direct perception, is fit for entering into the heart because it is a place of wonderment, being strung together by pleasant songs. In drama, there is a concealment of one's own [i.e., actor's] form through four kinds of acting; which concealment is accompanied by trace impressions born from an actor's knowledge, by means of the prologue (*prastāvanādinā*), and so on. The apperception (*anuvyavasāya*) produced by the performer, who is in the midst of the collocation of stimuli, accompanied by trace impressions [of the actor], assisted by trace impressions of the sensitive audience, with sympathetic communication of the hearts as the cooperating cause for [emotional] identification, consists of the light of an innate bliss of consciousness, colored by various forms of mental states whose shapes are joy, sorow, and so on. Thus, its various synonyms are tasting, savoring, wonderment relishing, etc. The real thing (*vastu*) that is manifest among these [names] is drama.[351]

Abhinava says in fact that *anuvyavasāya,* apperception, is *rasa* and *camatkāra.* The mode in which the actor effects feelings in the audience is that which suggestions operate on the sensitive readers. In the same way that suggestion suppresses or subordinates its literal meanings to the revealed meaning, the actor suppresses his literal identity in order to reveal that of Rāma. Abhinava's superb comment on the verse, "*snigdhaśyāmala...*" (*Dhā* 2.1), and Ānanda's *vṛtti,* that the word 'Rāma' is suggestive because the literal meaning is suppressed to reveal the emotional content of what Rāma enjoys and suffers, show that the actor is the suggestor, stimulating full emotional revelations in the audience who lives out the feelings of Rāma in his own psyche. Only in this way can there be an identification with another's feelings, obviating the problem of one's mind and another's mind

351 *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., p. 36. "*tenānuvyavasāyavat viśeṣaviṣayīkāryaṃ nāṭyam.*" "*Rāmādiśabdasyatatra yad avabhāsate vastu tan nāṭyam.*"

without removing the process of sympathetic identification from the realm sensory and psychic perceptions.

To say that the theater is an *anvyavasāya,* Abhinava also commits himself to the position that there is an apperceiver, who looks on and enjoys the inner spectacle of emotions and savors its *rasa* s. In this sense, Abhinava speaks of the aesthetic feeling that is an *ātmaviśrānti.* Mental movements that chase after effects in the external world, lacking repose in the self, are not a solid mass of consciousness. They cannot be aesthetic, because the mind is pained by agitation. Even a woman in grief, when abandoned to its overwhelming mass, finds solace in that repose. Repose in the self is a self-absorbed relishing of the drama of the mind. To this effect Abhinava writes the benedictory verse of chapter seven of the *Abhinavabhāratī*:

> The basic emotion in the heart of the enlightened
> is transient emotion in the love-agitated masses.
> The great emotional effect, the object of the emotional cause within
> is the shape of pure *rasa.*
> Let the three-eyed god be my clear and serene heart.[352]

The word 'apperception' naturally brings up the problem of another and more basic perception.[353] The concept of *saṃvid* in Śaiva philosophy accomodates itself extremely to Abhinava's aesthetic theory. Because a *saṃvid* by nature consists of levels in which percepts arranged into coherent thoughts, it is possible for the Śaiva philosopher to postulate that

---

352 *Abh* 7., Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 337. "*sthāyī prabuddhahṛdaye vyabhicāribhūtaḥ/kāmākulāsu janatāsu mahānubhāvaḥ//antarvibhāvaviṣayo rasamātramūrtiḥ/ śrīmānprasanna hṛdayo 'stu mama trinetraḥ.*"

353 See discussions of perception and apperception in chapter 4.

although sensory percepts are the same in ordinary and aesthetic experiences, thought contents in these situations are quite different. The difference lies in the goals that govern the arrangement; percepts as arranged come to the conscious mind in particular modes of experience.

In fact, as we have seen previously, an apperception is inherent in all cognitions; it is responsible for modal differences in the creative functions of the mind. While other Indian philosophical systems have a rudimentary notion of apperception as, "*ayaṃ ghaṭaḥ. ghaṭam aham jānāmi,*" which explains in part a self-awareness and a representation of an object in "my consciousness," Śaiva philosophers suppose that every object-awareness must be combined with an underlying subject-awareness. The consciousness of the "I," as the light of consciousness (*ahaṃ prakāśātmā prakāśe*), is ever present. According to Śomānanda and his followers, self-awareness is the innate joy of *camatkāra* which is the power behind all conscious awarenesses. Sentience consists precisely in the spirit and will to image an object as desired. Just so, in the aesthetic context a spectator has the same joy of being the cause and experiencer of his feelings. Furthermore, as far as it can be said that in a mental construct, *vikalpa,* pure sensory percepts are combined with mentally and conventionally constructed concepts to create a determinate cognition, the Śaiva theory of knowledge shows that a process from an incipient thought to its full development in different modes of experience is a complex one. Since there is continuity between the initial *vimarśa* up to its complete development into an effective action *arthakriyā,* as one might say that continuity exists in a pottter's initial awareness of a pot (as a desire to make a pot) up to completing the making

of a pot, a purpose is inherent in the first moment of an object-awareness and tends to the completion of the initial impulse, i.e., the desire to create. A *saṃvid* is the full consciousness comprehending levels of objectification and providing such a continuity. An apperception is the mind's (*manas*) function of stringing together various percepts as events, so that they cohere in a purpose through which an action culminates in attaining its object.

In this sense, one may say that an aesthetic experience is a kind of knowledge which is an action. The action is the relishing of the bliss of one's own delicate consciousness.[354] The theater is the place where *saṃvid*'s imaginative capacity has no boundary or obstruction (*sā cāvighnā saṃvic camatkāraḥ*). In the theater, the psyche is so disposed that trace impressions deposited deep in it are stimulated and heightened, into hue-shifting configurations to be enjoyed with wonderment (*camatkāra*). Abhinava describes the stringing of the beads of transient emotions on the filament of a basic emotion in a way that recalls his description of apperception. Of apperception, he says:

> In our philosophy it has already been established that the cognizer, a living being, being the self of his own experiences (*saṃvedana*) is like the inward string of a garland of cognitions (*jñānamālāyā*).[355]

Of the permanent emotion in an aesthetic experience, he says,

---

[354] *DhāL* 1.4, VSS 97, p. 50. "*kiṃ tu śabdasamarpyamāṇahṛdaya-saṃvādasundaravibhāvānubhāvasamucitaprāgviniviṣṭaratyādivāsanānurāgasukumāras vasaṃvidānandacarvaṇāvyāpārarasanīyarūpo rasaḥ.*"

[355] *IPV* 2.2.3, vol. 2, p. 42. "*iha jñānamālāyā antaḥsūtrakalpaḥ svasaṃvedanātmā pramātā jīvitabhūtaḥ iti upapāditaṃ prāk.*" The word *jñāna* tends to indicate sensory percepts or indeterminate cognitions.

> Therefore, these are transient emotions precisely in being threaded on the string of mental states that are the *sthāyin,* permanent emotions; receiving back to itself a hundred and a thousand qualities of rising and falling colors. Like beads of crystal, glass, iron, topaz, emerald and sapphires threaded on red and blue strings showing through the gaps in their midst, although these beads do not permanently give their own colorful traces to the string, they take up the configuration of a decoration made by that string. Being themselves multicolored and coloring the filament of a *sthāyin* they lead the string of a permanent emotion to a state of brilliance at different intervals, although it is pure. They are called transient emotions because they make shine as they inevitably induce [in a permanent emotion] mottled colors of the gems of preceding and following transient emotions.[356]

Of the self which is the great *sthāyin* of the *śāntarasa,* he says,

> What is the savoring of the truth of the *rasa* like? It is said: the self itself is colored by zeal, love, and so on, that bestow colorings. That very self appears as a bright, white string that shows through in the intervals between gems that cover it, shining even as the truth among all the colorings such as love, and so on, in such a way that the perception "this is the self" flash out suddenly.[357]

In sum, it may be said that Abhinava, in describing the structure of the aesthetic experience, supposes that the theater is an extraordinary place because it is the expanse of the universal condition, *sādhāraṇībhāva.* An aesthetic experience begins with a sympathetic susceptibility to the

---

[356] *Abh* 6., Nagar ed, p. 281-282. "*Tasmāt sthāyirūpacittavṛttisūtrasyūtā evāmī vyabhicāriṇaḥ... pratibhāsanta iti vyabhicāriṇa ucyante*."

[357] *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., p. 335. "*Tattvāsvādo 'sya kīdṛśaḥ. ucyate--uparāgadāyibhir utsāharatyādibhir uparaktam... ayam ātmeti nyāyena bhāsanam....*"

suggestive mode of poetic language and dramatic stimuli. In both cases the mind is prone to imagining because it teems with beginningless trace impressions. It is in the nature of consciousness to become aware and of the mind to make images, drawing from the psyche's store of trace impressions.

Intuition is the source of the imaginative power. As the Śaiva philosophers explain it: the cognizer, who is the Lord, is that intuition which is colored by various things. Each thought is a new creation by the cognizer, as traces of past experiences rush in to form new ones.

In an aesthetic experience, the imagination is particularly tantalized by stimuli in the mode of conveyance that reveals by concealment. The private, inner feelings of a sympathetic and sensitive audience are intensified because they balance on a duplicity of the suggestive language as on the concealed identity of the actor disguised as hero under paints, headgears and costumes. This mode of conveyance which thrives on an opposition--or, rather, collision--of truth and untruth removes constraints of the straitly ordinary world; and in the world of the theater, strange and wonderful colorings of the inner life come into view.

Intuition in aesthetic experience

The statement

> *tasmād anuvyavasāyātmakaṃ kīrtanaṃ rūṣitavikalpasaṃvedanaṃ nāṭyam. tad vedanavedyatvāt. na tu anukaraṇarūpam*

> Therefore, the theater is a [re]telling of the nature of an apperception which is a perception of tinged mental constructs. But, because it is to be perceived by a perception, it is not in the form of an imitation.

furnishes a direct link between Abhinava's literary criticism and his theory of knowledge. The *Īśvarapratyabhijñā* and the *Vimarśinī* describe conscious thoughts as mental constructs colored by various sensuously perceived things. Such constructs are synthetic. The intuitive mind draws on trace impressions and combines them with sense-percepts into a single, coherent, verbalized thought. Intuition, *pratibhā*, is taken as the intuitive faculty and the content of the intuitive mind. In the *rasasūtra*, as he says that the boundless *saṃvid* is *camatkāra*, Abhinava elaborates this state of wonderment with a verse from Act V of Kālidāsa's *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*:

> And, whether it is of the nature of an immediate experience, a mental perception, an imagination, or a memory, it flashes out as the truth. Let it be as [Kālidāsa] says,
>
> "Having seen lovely sights and having heard sweet sounds,
> Although a person is delighted, he becomes anxiously longing.
> Perhaps he recalls in his mind something he did not realize before
> --loves in previous life that are fixed in his feelings."
>
> In this situation, indeed, the memory which is shown in the statement, "he remembers," is not well-known to logicians because its object has not been experienced before. But, rather, it is of the nature of an immediate experience whose other synonym is intuition.[358]

Abhinava uses this episode to describe an intuition as the mind's capacity to call upon trace-impressions of which a person is not self-consciously aware. They have been somehow fixed in past experiences and subliminally

---

358 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 278. "*sa ca sākṣātkārasvabhāvo mānaso 'dhyavasāyo vā saṃkalpo vā smṛtir vā tathātvena sphuraty. astu yad āha "ramaṇīyāni vīkṣya madhurāṃś ca niśamya śabdān/ paryutsuko bhavati yat sukhito 'pi jantuḥ// taccetasā smaraty nūnam abodhapūrvaṃ/ bhāvasthirāṇi jananāntarasauhṛdāni."// atra hi smaratīti yā smṛtir upadarśitā sā na tārkikaprasiddhā pūrvam etasyārthasyānanubhūtatvāt. api tu pratibhānāparaparyāyasākṣātkārasvabhāveyam iti.*"

color one's state of mind in an inexplicable way. It is a process which logicians cannot explain and therefore do not admit as a valid means of knowledge. Intuition, nevertheless, is vivid and unerring because it gives vent to a part of the psychic life that is real and urges itself upon one's conscious level of awareness. As Indians see it, subliminally each human is connected through his/her beginningless trace impressions with all times, places and events that have been experienced in past lives. Knowledge of the past lies buried in consciousness and, when somehow recalled, brings with it an inexplicable authoritativeness to bear on a present situation.

Duṣyanta's mental event in this case cannot be called an imaginative or poetic thought. An anxiety comes into mind uncontrollably, without its perceiver's knowing the cause or means. The king hears music made by his beautiful queen, yet he finds no delight and longs for something unknown. Kālidāsa suggests perhaps he recalls some love from another life. Naturally, the audience knows that the king is troubled because, his memory of having married Śakuntalā having been suppressed, he has cruelly banished her and shamed her before his court. His subconscious memories are plaguing him. Puṇyarāja, in order to illustrate Bhartṛhari's notion of intuition, also cites Act I, 19, of the same play as an example: the king trusts in his intuitive feeling that Śakuntalā is a woman befitting him in birth because he, being a man of good conscience, could not have been in love with her otherwise.[359]

[359] Cited in Iyer, *Bh*, p. 87. "*Pratibhā* includes intelligence of a high order, intuitive knowledge, the instinct of animals and birds and the spontaneous activities of newly-born babies. This kind of knowledge is far more reliable. It comes from within. While speaking about it, Puṇyarāja reminds us of Kālidāsa's statement that, when in doubt, cultured people rely on the voice of their own conscience. It was an inner

While king Duṣyanta grapples with the emergence and submergence of his trace-impressions, memories lost and regained, the audience is well aware that this marriage has been ordained and divinely sanctioned so that the offspring of the union will found a great dynasty. The king knows only through his subconscious mind, but he cannot consciously pinpoint the knowledge. Abhinava uses the above verse to exemplify an intuitive thought, or some mental content intuited. As the Śaivas say that *vikalpa* is *naisargika* and *svairacāriṇī*, the intuitive mind is innate and free, acting at will, in its synthesis. Thought constructs are conditioned by the beginningless variety of trace impressions in store in one's subconsciousness, combined in unaccountable ways, and emerge in self-consciousness as a perceptible mental event. But it is because the subjective agency of consciousness is free and sovereign in combining the immediate sense reports and trace-impressions, that there can be variations to thought and originality of the imaginative mind. The outcome of mental-event formation is not determined only extrinsically, through objects of sense and the senses, but also through the intuitive subjectivity that brings together flows of percepts and predispositions into a coherent and unified thought-object.[360]

In his disagreement with Bhaṭṭanāyaka, it is evident that Abhinava's arguments for the *rasa* as an object perceived, produced, and revealed rest on the fact that the process of universalization pervades the whole theater. A *rasa* is produced by a conjunction of *vibhāva, anubhāva,* and *vyabhicāribhāva* with the *sthāyin* s; and intuition is a necessary

---

pratibhā that told Duḥṣyanta that Śākutalā was fit to be married by a *Kṣatriya*." And n. 20, "See Puṇyarāja on Vāk. II. 147 and Kālidāsa, *Sākuntalam*, Act 1, 19."

360 *IPK* 1.62-66, KSTS 34, 26-7. IPVV 1.6.10-1.7-3, vol. 1. pp. 338-359.

cooperating cause in both the poet and the sympathetic reader. Abhinava concisely states a definite if not well-defined structure of a *rasa* perception in a passage directly following the one quoted above,

> To begin with, this is entirely a perception consisting of savoring in which just love shines out. Precisely because it is not conditioned (*anupahita*) by another sense-object, being something to be savored, it is not a worldly, not false, not inexpressible, not like a worldly experience, and not imposed on that [worldly experience]... By all means, a *rasa* is just a *bhāva* which is to be perceived by an unobstructed perception consisting of relishing. In it, the obstructions to *vibhāva,* and so on, has been dispelled.[361]

The theater is a continuum consisting of the universalized state, *sādhāraṇībhāva,* in which obstructions to experiencing the *vibhāva* s, and so on, purely as aesthetic stimuli have been completely removed. Under this condition, the permanent emotions (*sthāyin*) become aesthetic sentiments (*rasa*) which are objects of relishing. The theater is a continuum of an unobstructed consciousness (*avighnā saṃvid*) in that it provides room for freely exercising the imaginative capacity. In one passage describing the mental activity called *anuvyavasāya*,[362] Abhinava mentions *saṃskāra* three times, and it is evident that a freedom of the imagination consists in allowing the trace impressions to emerge in profusion in their coloration of mental constructs.

---

[361] *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 273. "*sarvathā tāvad eṣāsti pratītir āsvādātmā yasyāṃ ratir eva bhāti. tata eva viśeṣāntarānupahitatvāt sā rasanīyā satī na laukikī na mithyā nānirvācyā na laukikatulyā na tadāropādirūpā... sarvathā rasanātmakavītavighnapratītigrāhyo bhāva eva rasaḥ. tatra vighnāpasārakā vibhāvaprabhṛtayaḥ.*"

[362] *Abh* 1., Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 36.

Thus, according to Abhinava, mental operations are basically the same in a dramatic as in an ordinary situation. In both instances the active consciousness, whose function of synthetic thought is intuition, manifests constructs by means of logical and emotive paraphernalia. In real life where a thought or a feeling is conditioned by a purposeful activity toward a goal, the thought is just the state of mind impelling one toward an action. In the theater, the aesthetic distance consists in a process of 'apperception' in which thoughts and feelings are objects to be viewed and relished.

In Śaiva terms, a thought in an ordinary context is colored by *saṃskāra* s and governed by rules of rational thinking. It becomes coherent through a *samanvaya,* logical connection, between the elements in that stream of thought; the *samanvaya* is supplied by conventions and *vyavahāra,* a community of common usage, comprising criteria of validity. In a freely imaginative thought, whose presentation is immediate without the impression of having been perceived before, the mind is innate and willful in its construction. Abhinava says in *IPV* 1.6.10 that no one has seen an elephant with a thousand tusks and a hundred trunks, but that the mind is capable of imagining it.[363] Even if the elephant does not exist, the mental image, at least, is real. Intuition, as the synthetic function of consciousness, is instrumental in the subjective autonomy and sovereignty of the imagination. In this way, the *Pratyabhijñā* philosophy attributes to the intuitive and constructive consciousness the power to create anew, *apūrvanirmāṇasāmarthya.* The subject, in the act of knowing, creates.

---

[363] *IPV* 1.6.10, vol. 1, pp. 338-339. "*tathā hi aparidṛṣṭapūrvam api... bhāsayati.*"

Chapter 6

Discussion and conclusion: the creative intuition

Abhinavagupta makes a claim that drama and poetry, considered as one mode of experience and instruction, are a very excellent means to achieve human goals. Poetry is a mode of instruction that imparts knowledge delightfully, in the manner of a wife; drama is vivid, being immediately present before the eyes like a direct perception, and goes directly to the heart.[364] The structure of an aesthetic perception, as described in the previous chapter, is complex: although it arises from a basis of direct cognition and inference, an aesthetic perception is an act of imagination that is colored by external stimuli but consists in the main in an emotional and psychic construction of memory and trace impressions. Direct perceptions of dramatic actions and inferences of emotions arouse the spectators' feelings to emerge in their imagination. These, not being caused by external objects do not end in an outward-oriented action, culminate rather as an object of an inward-directed action of relishing.

Abhinava deems the *śāntarasa* the one great *rasa* that is the origin of all others,[365] and maintains that in its savoring the soul itself shines forth

---

364 *Abh* 1.1, Nagar, ed., vol. 1, p. 6 "*tathā hi--dhīrodāttadhīralalitadhīroddhata-dhīrapraśāntānām... sātiśayacamatkāragocarībhūtair hṛdayānupraveśaṃ vidadhad dharmādicatuṣkopāyopādeyadhiyam adharādibhyaś ca nivṛttiṃ nirviśaṅkaṃ vidhatta ity asmākam adhigataśrutitattvānām api pratyakṣasiddham evaitat. prasiddhā cāsya nāṭyavedasaṃjñā viditā.*"

365 "*ityādinā rasāntaraprakṛtitvam upasaṃhṛtam*" *Abh* ch. 6, GOS 36, p. 341; Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 335.

with a sudden clarity: "This is the soul."[366] In accordance with the teleological structure of Indian philosophies, a means of valid knowledge is that by which one judges and gains an intermediate correct knowledge in the world for the sake of reaching the higher and highest knowledge that justifies all strivings in the interim. An aesthetic experience is productive of valid knowledge in the ordinary world (*vyavahāra*) and of higher goals.

In contrast to other critics who judge the reality of the theater as true or false in comparison with the reality of everyday life, Abhinava sees an inherent validity in the structure of aesthetic experience itself. This validity is implied in the valuation of life in the world and its ordinary transactions as a real even relative to *mokṣa*, in the same way that an indeterminate cognition (*nirvikalpa jñāna*) is inherent in and continuous with a mentally constructed and verbally articulated determinate cognition (*vikalpajñāna*).[367]

The primary goal of poetry and drama is an exquisite enjoyment. Beyond the pleasures of literature, the aesthetic wonderment of *camatkāra* implies the self's awareness of its own power of imagination. Ānandavardhana suggests that at its great moments, literature has intimations of the divine. In a different way for Abhinava, the enjoyment of literature nourishes the spirit. When he speaks of the self, shining out in the midst of imaginings as

---

366 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 335 "*tattvāsvādo 'sya kīdṛśaḥ. ucyate-- uparāgadāyibhir utsāharatyādibhir uparaktaṃ yad ātmasvarūpaṃ tad eva viralombihitaratnāntarālanirbhāsamānasitatarasūtravadābhātasvarūpaṃ sakaleṣu ratyādiṣūparañjakeṣu tathābhāvenāpi sakṛdvibhāto 'yamātmeti nyāyena bhāsamānaṃ paronmukhatātmakasakaladuḥkhajālahīnaṃ paramānandalābhasaṃvid ekatvena kāvyaprayogaprabandhābhyāṃ sādhāraṇatayā nirbhāsamānam antarmukhāvasthābhedena lokottarānandānayanaṃ tathāvidhahṛdayaṃ vidhatta iti.*"

367 *IPV* 1.11-14, 19. See translation, vol. 3, pp. 70-76, 81-83.

a colorless thread that strings together shimmering beads of feelings, Abhinava seems to be describing his understanding of an ever present reality in human nature. The changing images and moods of drama are made anew with every moment, but its maker, the self that is the cognizer, is quiescent. Intuitions, tinged by various external sense-objects and internal trace impressions, are creative of an aesthetic world that each viewer relishes. Consciousness and its intuitive faculty, like Śiva and the goddess, are two aspects of an individual world-creation that reflects the universe of all imaginings. Aesthetic enjoyment reposes in the self because, there, the spectator sees the deepest and permanent basis of all feelings that otherwise overcome and drive him to actions in the world.

Saṃvid in the aesthetic context

Having previously argued that intuition is a cooperating cause in perceiving a *rasa* on the part of the audience[368] as well as of the poet, in commenting on verse 1.6 of the *Dhā*, Abhinava brings in several opinions from external sources, namely, of Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Bhaṭṭatauta to support his attempt to establish that intuition, *pratibhā*, is not inferrable on the part of the audience, and for that reason the experience of the poet, hero/actor, and the audience is the same.

For the sake of structural uniformity, Abhinava at first makes the poet's

[368] *Dhā* 1.4, VSS 97, p. 60-61. On the audience's intuition: "*tac chaktitrayopajanitārthāvagamamūlajātatatpratibhāsapavitritapratipattṛprati-bhāsahāyārthadyotanaśaktir dhvananavyāpāraḥ; sa ca prāgvṛttaṃ vyāpāratrayaṃ nyakkurvan pradhānabhūtaḥ kāvyātmeti*" On the poet's intuition: "*etadabhidhāsyamānapratīyamānānuprāṇitakāvyanirmāṇa-nipuṇapratibhābhājanatvenaiva mahākavivyapadeśō bhavatīti bhāvaḥ.*"

creative process one in which a permanent emotion, *sthāyin*, is turned into a *rasa* as a result of the propriety of its stimuli, *vibhāva* and *anubhāva*. This creative process is exemplified by Vālmīki, the first poet. The same process now occurs in the audience as they listen to a poem or watch a play. *Pratibhā* exists and functions in the poet and the sympathetic audience. Through sympathy (*hṛdayasaṃvāda*) and identification (*tanmayībhāva*) on the part of the audience with the author by means of literature and drama, a spectator's emotions, stimulated and colored by appropriate *vibhāva* and *anubhāva*, become an object of his/her own relishing. Thus, as he closes his comment on *Dhā* 1.4, Abhinava says,

> **For grief**: is the permanent emotion of compassion which is itself the experience of relishing [a permanent emotion]. For although grief is a permanent emotion, the *vibhāva* and *anubhāva* appropriate to it are a mental state which in being an object of relishing is a *rasa*. Thus it is said that from propriety (*aucitya*) a permanent emotion becomes a *rasa*; because a multitude of mental states, previously perceived in oneself and inferred in others, as they create (*ādadhāna*) a sympathy between the hearts by means of a sequence of trace-impressions, are appropriated for relishing.[369]

Commenting on *Dhā* 1.6, Abhinava represents Bhaṭṭanāyaka's view of the sensitive audience as a calf that effortlessly savors the *rasa* from the Cow of Speech, the mother goddess who freely gives her essence out of love

[369] *DhāL* 1.5, VSS 97, p. 91. "*Śoko hīti karuṇasya taccarvaṇāgocarātmanaḥ sthāyibhāvaḥ. śoke hi sthāyibhāve ye vibhāvānubhāvās tatsamucitā cittavṛttiś carvyamāṇātmā rasa ity aucityāt sthāyino rasatāpattir ity ucyate. prāksvasaṃviditaṃ paratrānumitaṃ ca cittavṛttijātaṃ saṃskārakrameṇa hṛdayasaṃvādam ādadhānaṃ carvaṇāyām upayujyate yataḥ.*"

for her young. In contrast, Abhinava's views the aesthetic process as requiring work on the part of everyone involved. The goddess Speech must be gently urged into yielding her shining gems, these gems being the 'sweet substance of [suggestive] meanings' (*svādu tad arthavastu*) spoken of in *Dhā* 1.6. The poet's intuition, in the sense of creative imagination, is not something inferrable by the audience, but it is rather that which the audience must identify with through his own imaginative power. For this reason, Bhaṭṭatauta says that the experience of the hero (as recreated by the actor), the poet and the audience is the same.[370] Exercising the imaginative, intuitive power is precisely the process of recreating another's experience out of one's own trace impressions, i.e., the *anukīrtana* as described in the *Abhinavabhāratī* which has been discussed in chapter five.

In *DhāL* 3.43, when he glosses Ānanda's use of the word '*dṛṣṭi*' as *pratibhāna*, Abhinava again speaks of *pratibhā* as a 'sight' (or an insight, '*prajñā*,' of *DhāL* 1.6) associated with the operation, or action, which causes the relishing of the *sthāyibhāva*. This is to say that [the poet's] intuition--his imagination--makes a permanent emotion, which is in essence something to be relished, fit for being relished. The commentor explains that 'intuition' is to be understood as a transferred meaning from the literal meaning of '*dṛṣṭi*,' which signifies an ocular and sensory perception. The poet who has imagination can string together a new and variegated world at every moment because even as he is practiced in observing the real world, his 'sight' of such a world increases imagination. Perceptions of the empirical world as expressible in the literal use of language are subordinated to the

---

370 *Dhā* and *L* 1.6, VSS 97, pp. 92-94; Ingalls et al., trs., pp. 119-121.

suggestive function in poetic language. The poet's intuition is a special sight which sees literally and suggestively and whose creation always supposes a mutual cooperation between reality and imagination.[371]

Viewed in the light the Śaiva theory of cognition, poetic intuition belonging to the poet and the audience, is the same as that which functions an ordinary, determinate cognition. A determinate cognition (*vikalpa*), is consciousness's reflection (*vimarśa*) that blooms forth with all its ramifications in accordance with the goal in which that cognition achieves its purposeful activity. As we have seen previously, cognition is an active and fundamentally imaginative process: because the mind constructs concepts at will out of trace impressions, cognitive contents depend as much on the arrangements of their conceptual and psychic constituents as on the pure sensory percepts of cognized objects.

Pramāṇa

Not surprisingly, Abhinava postulates that the success of a purposeful action is the criterion of valid knowledge, *pramāṇa*. A person does not strive toward a purposeful action out of correct knowledge alone; he/she strives toward a goal out of a variety of reasons, the most important of which is the desire to experience something that has been satisfying in the past, even when he/she knows that the means in the present is doubtful. By analogy, a play-goer does not aim to produce any real thing but rather to

[371] *DhāL* 3.43, VSS 97, p. 541. "*rasān iti : rasyamānatāsārān sthāyibhāvān rasayitum rasyamānatāpattiyogyān kurvan... api tvārthāntare aindriyakavijñānābhyāsollasite pratibhānalakṣaṇe 'rthe saṃkrāntam*." See Ingalls et al. trs., p. 654.

enjoy himself/herself in being one with others in the audience. The goal is real, and the experience is real; the theater is neither a false cognition of the real world nor an absolute entity beyond the range of perception ordinarily existing in the world. Abhinava is able to state in a logically rigorous way that an aesthetic experience, consisting in the relishing of feelings and being brought about by the suggestive function of language in poetry as in the theater, is a real and valid experience. The subject of validity is fully expounded in *IPV* 2.3. It cannot be treated fully here and is therefore described briefly as follows.

Since they say that all changes occurring in succession are activities of the subject who is independent and sovereign in the power to synthesize and represent inner manifestations at will, the Śaivas are averse to saying that there are errors of cognition. All manifestations, as an individual's cognitions or Maheśvara's manifestations, are created ever anew. Since all are the synthetic products of the unity of the self, they are existent and valid for the moment. The fact that some cognitions are proved false at a later time does not prevent them from being valid when they are perceived. When they are sublated, this is not an error of cognition. Rather, the continuity of the cognition has been interrupted because the development of a *vimarśa* does not reach its completion in a purposeful action.[372]

---

[372] *IPV* 2.3.13, vol. 3, tr., p. 157-159. Vol. 2, p. 125. "*apareyaṃ bhrāntir ucyate, anuvṛttyucitasyāpi vimarśasyāsthairyāt. ataś ca pṛthak idantādyābhāseṣu na kācana bhrāntiḥ, melanāṃśe tu vimarśānuvṛttinirmūlanaṃ vimarśodayakālād eva ārabhya bādhakena kriyate, iti tatraiva bhrāntibhāvaḥ, iti siddham.*" "The mistake is said to be this other thing, because of the instability of a presentation (*vimarśa*) even though it is piled up in an unfolding (i.e., even though the incipient presentation has begun to be developed into a full cognitive object). Therefore, in regard to each of the appearances as an object, a 'this,' there is no error whatsoever, but in regard to the part of mixing

This theory of relative knowledge stems from Somānanda's doctrine which has been set down in chapter 4 of the *Śivadṛṣṭi*. The earlier Śaiva philosopher is anxious to state that since Śiva exists as manifestations in all things, therefore, nothing that consists of the Lord can be an error.[373] Somānanda tries to show that validity is relative according to points of view and usage, as, for example, monetary currencies are different with each locality according to the king's command.[374] In the *IPV,* just as Śiva is autonomous in manifesting all things at will, so each individual subject is autonomous in the creation of their determinate knowledge, inasmuch as each cognition is a unity, and because a unity of related diverse things can effect a purpose.[375] A purpose is achieved not because of correct knowledge alone but for many reasons, the most important of which is an intense desire,[376] and it is preceded by our former experiences which are united in a single determinate perception that relates our past feelings of satisfaction with a future goal.[377]

---

together (i.e., the presentation of one thing is mixed up with that of another thing), there is an uprooting of a *vimarśa*'s development which is made by a subiator beginning from the very time that a *vimarśa* arises."

373 *ŚD* 4.6-7, p. 128. "*Tathā yatra sad ity evaṃ pratītis tad asat katham/ yat sat tat paramārtho hi paramārthas tataḥ Śiva/ sarvabhāveṣu cidvyakteḥ sthitaiva pramārthatā/ mithyājñānavikalpyānāṃ sattvaṃ cidvyaktiśaktatā//*" "Just so wherever there is the perception of existence, how can there be non-existence. Whatever exists, that is absolute reality; for, from that [existence] Śiva is absolutely real. It has been established that the manifestation of consciousness is absolutely real in respect to all existents. The existence of imaginable false knowledges is the state of being manifested by consciousness."

374 *ŚD* 4.8-11, pp. 129-130.

375 *IPV*, 2.3.9, vol. 2, p. 113; translation, vol. 3, p. 153.,

376 *IPV* 2.3.1-2, vol. 3, p. 143-4.

377 *IPV* 2.2.7, vol. 3, pp. 137-38

A purposeful action is the goal to be achieved in the purview of a presentation (*vimarśa*) whose development (*anuvṛtti*) is not interrupted, which is to say that a person has an incipient idea in mind. This idea unfolds into the fulfillment of its purpose. A means of valid knowledge consists in the continuity of this incipient cognition throughout until the completion of the purpose. If the goal is achieved in accordance with the aim of a cognition, then the latter is valid. Otherwise, if the goal is not achieved, the cognition is not valid: it is interrupted and replaced by a new cognition. Abhinava defines it in this way,

> Whatever creates the result of a *vimarśa,* whose stability (*sthairya*) is not sublated and therefore whose unfolding (*anuvṛtti*) is not obstructed, that is a valid means of kowledge in the form of awareness (*bodha*), based on the object of awareness and resting in the cognizer himself.[378]

It is to be noted that the cognition relevant to a purposeful action is an indeterminate cognition (*vimarśa*). According to Abhinava, even the first presentiment of an idea is accompanied by a subtle verbalization. The indeterminate, rather than a determinate, cognition is developed in an 'after-function' (*anuvṛtti*) into an action-effective idea, and finally into action itself. A continuity between an initial awareness, its fully verbalized thought, and its completed action underlies Abhinava's notion of a valid means of knowledge. The author says,

> The result of a valid means of knowledge is an operation; and an operation is established as not different in form, because it is carried out

[378] *IPV* 2.3.1-2, vol. 3, p. 144.

or because it is caused to be carried out, because the cause and the result of the means of valid knowledge are not different. And because a means of valid knowledge is *vimarśa* which depends on words, and a word proceeds in respect of only one manifestation unmixed with other manifestations in the form of time and space, and so on.[379]

The process of cognition, from indeterminate to determinate, involves an incipient presentation which, when determined by intuition as what it is and what it is not, becomes a determinate cognition. Intuitions bring forth trace-impressions in consciousness which are associable with percepts in immediate presentation. Abhinava describes in a similar way the unfolding of an aesthetic imagination. Upon seeing an actor, there is a determination (*adhyavasāya*) that the sense-object is Rāma. It is the unfolding or development (*anuvṛtti*) of Rāma/actor's trace impressions in the dramatic portrayals that stimulates the spectator's own trace impressions to develop after Rāma's. The result is that the spectator thus becomes identified with Rāma; for a duration of time he lives in the midst of Rāma's exploits and sees the world through Rāma's eyes.[380]

This unfolding of an initial sensory-perception into a fully detailed experience can be directly linked with intuition. Inasmuch as various intuitions afford possibilities for determining a purely sensory perception, when a determination is made, the intuition of what it is contains within it the seeds of development provided with all qualifications which can effect

---

379 *IPV* 2.3.2, vol. 2, p. 75. "*kiṃ ca iha vyāpārarūpam eva phalaṃ vyāpāraś ca vyāpriyamāṇāt vyāpāryamāṇāt vā ananyākāra eva siddhaḥ iti--abhedaḥ pramāṇaphalayoḥ vimarśabalena ca yataḥ pramāṇam. vimarśaś ca śabdajīvitaḥ. śabdaś ca ābhāsāntaraiḥ deśakālādirūpair anāmṛṣṭe ekatraivābhāsamātre parvartate.*"

380 *Abh* 1., Nagar ed., p. 35. See also n. 347 and text, ch. 5, p. 203.

an action. Abhinava expresses the idea that an intuition, as the incipient thing-concept determination (*so 'yam*), contains in itself the unfolding of all later stages of expression. And this intuition, as the initial, noumenous Speech, is active in the first moment of an indeterminate presentation. He says,

> That which possesses the three limbs, namely, the *paśyantī, madhyamā,* and *vaikharī* in the form of a triad of objectifications, is the supreme goddess who embraces the multitude of all differentiated things to be objectified. Speech bespeaks itself; it is called Speech because, 'it reflects' (*vakti svarūpaṃ vimṛśatīti vāk*).[381]

Considered in this way, the validity of a presentation that develops continuously into an action consists in a non-interruption of a original awareness. The universalized time-space continuum of the theater, assisted by the pleasures of songs and dances, provides an atmosphere in which the imaginative re-creation of drama proceeds with no obstruction. Universalization thus clears the path for the unfolding (*anuvṛtti*) of an original perception, i.e., that this is Rāma. An aesthetic imagination then thrives on the suggestive nature of stimuli. The spectator's own mental states are shaped after the mental states of Rāma. This unfolding of the first perception, "this is Rāma," follows the vicissitudes of Rāma's pleasures and pains; it culminates in the act of savoring a *rasa* and thus fulfills the purpose which the original cognition serves.[382] Of the action of savoring,

---

[381] *IPVV* 1.1, vol. 1, p. 15. "*trayo'vayavāḥ paśyantīmadhyamāvaikharīti yasyāḥ sā trayī parāmarśarūpā kroḍīkṛtābhinnasamastaparāmarśanīyarāśiḥ parā bhagavatī. vakti svarūpaṃ vimṛśatīti vāk*"

[382] Cf. the aesthetic unfolding in *Abh,* in the paragraph beginning with "*kāvye tu*

Abhinava has this to say,

> By means of these things composed by the poet and made to be like a direct perception by the actor, a thorough enjoyment in the nature of an unobstructed experience which is a *rasa* is produced instantly. For the action of savoring is not achieved in the termination, like the action of going, but rather in the very first moment. And it precisely consists in an immediate perception of the *vibhāva*. A *rasa* is led to the presence of relishing and so on through skills in leading [i.e., acting] (*nayanacāturya*) of him who is taken as the range (i.e., object) of relishing in the first place....[383]

The above passage shows that Abhinava thinks of relishing as an action, with a *rasa* as its object, following from the first moment of determining that the actor, as a sense-object, is Rāma in content. The act of relishing arises immediately upon the audience's perceiving drama as if it were a real event and the actor as if he were Rāma, but knowing from its original intention that all this is a play. The success of relishing depends on a true-

---

guṇālaṅkāramanoharaśabdārthaśarīre lokottararasaprāṇake hṛdayasaṃvādavaśāt nimagnākārikā tāvad bhavati cittavṛttiḥ. kintu sarvasya pratyakṣasākṣātkārakalpā na dhīr udeti. nāṭye tu pāramārthikaṃ kiñcid adya me kṛtyaṃ bhaviṣyatīty... idānīm anukīrtanam anuvyavasāyaviśeṣo nāṭyāparaparyāyaḥ. nānukāra iti bhramitavyam." *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 35. In the middle Abhinava says, "*samyaṅmithyāsaṃśaya-sambhāvanādijñānavijñeyatvaparāmarśānāspade, rāmarāvaṇādiviṣayādhyavasāye, tatsaṃskārānuvṛttikāraṇabhūtatatsahacarahṛdyavasturūpagītātodyapramadānubhavasaṃskārasūcitasamanugatataduktarūparāmādhyavasāyasaṃskāra eva bhavan...*" See also nn. 347, 350 and translations, pp. 203, 207.

383 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., p. 303. "*etaiḥ kavinopanibadhair naṭena ca sākṣātkārakalpatām ānītaiḥ samyag ity avighnabhogātmakasambhogo rasa utpadyate jhaṭ ity eva. na hi gamanakriyāvat paryante rasanākriyā niṣpadyate. api tu prathama evāvasare. sa ca vibhāvasākṣātkārātmaka eva. tasya tu prathamakakṣyām eva rasanāgocaratvābhimatasya nayanacāturyādhibhī raso rasanādyābhimukhyaṃ nīyate.*"

false dialectic of dramatic reality culminating in savoring.

In this situation, the awareness of an awareness is the apperception, *anuvyavasāya,* of which Abhinava speaks. And when he says,

> *anuvyavasāyavad viśeṣaviṣayīkāryaṃ nāṭyam... tasmād anuvyavasāyātmakaṃ kīrtanaṃ rūṣitavikalpasaṃvedanaṃ nāṭyam. tad vedanavedyatvāt. na tv anukaraṇarūpam* [384]
>
> The theater is that of which particulars are to made its objects, like an apperception.... Therefore, the theater is a [re]telling of the nature of an apperception which is a perception of tinged mental constructs. But, because it is to be perceived by a perception, it is not in the form of an imitation,

the statement means in full that the mind produces and represents --from direct cognitions of actors and dramatic actions and from the spectator's own trace impressions forming memories and inferential judgements coloring emotional attitudes in his conscious mind--a series of mental events which are again objects in a more encompassing level of consciousness that arranges the whole set of representations into a coherent whole. The unity of that "apperceiving" consciousness, occurring after determinate cognitions, is conditioned by a coherence which tends toward accomplishing the goal, namely the savoring of *rasa.* It is this end, namely, the bliss of aesthetic enjoyment that governs the coherence in synthesizing the series of determinate mental events of the play into a whole and meaningful episode.

It is in this sense as well that Abhinava speaks of *pramāṇa* as the means

---

[384] *Abh,* Nagar ed, p. 36; GOS 37, p. 38.

of valid knowledge, which is continuous, i.e., which comprises the continuity of a single knowledge up to accomplishing its effect. In this context, the word "*ekaghanasaṃvid*" also gains another meaning-dimension: *saṃvid* is a compact mass because of its uninterruptedness, which is to say that our experience of a drama makes sense as an episode or a whole event because no other thought comes in between to interrupt the continuity. It is this continuity that fosters the experience of *rasa,* and because we experience a *rasa* that we say an aesthetic experience is a unity. In a more commonplace illustration, we see that a Walter Mitty-like experience also depends on non-intrusion of any other reality into a fanciful stretch of the imagination.

The validity of the aesthetic experience, accordingly, can be reconsidered in the light of the validity of a cognition. If a determinate cognition is valid, which is a unity persisting without contradiction or sublation throughout and culminating in a successful action, then the validity of the theater is precisely this: consciousness becomes an unobstructed, compact and gapless mass singularly focused on recreating images in drama. This solid mass of images, tinged with variegated feelings, culminate in a successful action, namely the bliss of savoring the *rasa.* The essence of the theater, according to Abhinavagupta, is a unity of one uninterrupted cognition, a continuum of *saṃvid,* ending in the fullfillment of relishing a *rasa.*

Other means of knowledge, such as inference, and so on, are effective for purposes of everyday life; and they are also valid. Reason in *vyavahāra,* the rational order, is based on invariability of *niyati,* the physical laws which Śiva ordains to regulate the universe. An inquirer asks: but it is known that some yogis supersede this law, who make at will an object produced in the

world by natural causes. Can one still trust the validity of inference, knowing that some things are created through the natural properties of empirical things and some are created by a yogi's will?

Abhinava says that in each case *vyavahāra* is a standard of a right judgement: in the event that *niyati* prevails, it forms a criterion for valid inferences. And in the case of yogic creation, it forms a criterion of common usage from which supernatural powers may deviate.[385] The validity of reason, inasmuch as it serves certain purposes, is not destroyed because another set of rules prevails. Abhinava calls his theory of error *apūrṇakhyāti,* or an incomplete knowledge, which can become more adequate with a subsequent and fuller combination, like a jeweller's knowledge that is sharpened by experience.[386] He is at pains to emphasize the reality of this world, which follows from the sovereignty and reality of individual subjects. If the criterion of validity of a cognition lies in being a unity of diverse things related in one awareness that leads to a succesful action, the world in which successful actions occur is the domain of valid cognitions. From the standpoint of utility which is a criterion of validity, the world is valid.

The ultimate means of valid knowledge is Śiva who cannot be measured by any limits or criteria. Śiva is the unity that continuously manifests the universe; Śiva's own being is the screen on which all phenomena are projected. Śomānanda says the Lord exists in all beings from the world of moving and unmoving creatures down to the lowest hell; the Lord is like a

---

385 *IPV* 2.4.10-11. See translation, vol. 3, 173-178.

386 See Navjivan Rastogi, "Theory of Error According to Abhinavagupta." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 14 (1986) 1-33.

great king, full of joy and caprice in his creations.[387] To say, as Abhinava does, that the self shines out in an aesthetic experience means in part that one recognizes oneself in this context as Śiva--the poet and the dancer who creates the three worlds with Himself as the screen. Abhinava says, in connection with permanent emotion of the peaceful *rasa* (*śāntarasa*), " *tattvajñānam ātmajñānam.* " "What, then, is a permanent emotion in this connection? Since it is said that the knowledge of the truth alone, to begin with, is the means of liberation, just its permanence is proper in respect of liberation. And the knowledge of the self alone is the knowledge of the truth"[388] The liberating knowledge, for Abhinava, is the recognition: "I am Śiva."

Intuition and self-knowledge

The problem of self-recognition arises through the fact that, in Abhinava's philosophy, the subject who manifests cannot be manifested, which is to say that the self cannot be represented or viewed. The subject whose nature is full consciousness (*saṃvid*) is an ever-expanding, active source that assimilates, combines, arranges and projects images. The term *saṃvid,* signifying the basic components of light and its reflection capable of originating complex mental functions, appears frequently and particularly in connection with the tasting of the *rasa.* Abhinava's speaks of a *saṃvid* as a solid mass of consciousness in which the aesthetic experience is enjoyed.

---

[387] *SD*, 1.36-38, p. 25. See n. 6, ch. 2, p. 13.

[388] *Abh.*, 7, Nagar ed., p. 331: " *kas tarhy atra sthāyī. ucyate iha tattvajñānam eva tāvan mokṣasādhanam iti tasyaiva mokṣe sthāyitā yuktā. tattvajñānaṃ ca nāmātmajñānam eva.* "

The usage of the term connotes not only a subject who unifies and manifests all mental images, but also the maker (*nirmātṛ*) who carries out actions in accordance with his inner designs.

In a curious way, although Abhinava affirms the reality of the world and imagination, he considers such a reality a reflection rather than the substance. While everything that exists is a real reflection in the mirror of the mind, there is no original, inasmuch as the subject who manifests is not perceptible.[389] Śiva, when in the pure and withdrawn form, is just a mass of transcendent and blissful consciousness. If it is said that the mind reflects the external world, there, again, the world is a reflection of Śiva's consciousness. In the *Paramārthasāra*, Abhinava says,

> There, the whole world, whose expanse is multifarious bodies,
> senses, and realms, is within.
> And in it, the enjoyer, the embodied one, is just Śiva who has
> taken to becoming a beast (*paśu*).
>
> Just as pure crystal takes the form of colors of various kinds,
> Just so, too, the Lord takes the form of gods, humans, beasts,
> and vegetations.
>
> Just as the moon moves over moving water and is still over still
> water,
> Just so is the soul in the assemblage of bodies, actions, and
> worlds.
>
> Just as Rāhu, although unseen, comes to light in the orb of the
> moon, just so
> the pervading soul shines in the mirror of the mind with the

389 *IPV* 2.1.5, vol. 2, p. 19. "*anābhāsaś ca pramātā, sa hi na kasya cit ābhāsate, tasya sarvam ābhāti yataḥ*" "The subject has no manifestation, for he is manifested to no one because everything appears from him."

senses as its support (*indriyāśrayeṇa* i.e., by means of).

Just as in a clear mirror, [one's] face shines out; just so, this light
shines in the substance of the mind, purified by Śiva's power
(*śivaśaktinirmale dhītattve*).

Because it rests in itself, the perfect, great joy in the form of
light,
it is full of will, consciousness, and the senses; it is full of
endless powers.

Pure and quiescent, devoid of all mental constructs, without rise
and fall,
in Him who is the ultimate substance the world of thirty-six
states shines.

Just as variegated towns and villages are continuous in a
mirror-reflection, and yet appear distinct from each other
and from the mirror as well,

Just so, although not separated from an awakening in the purest
and supreme Bhairava, this world appears divided within
itself and from Him.[390]

There are several images of the reflections: the soul shines in the mirror of the mind, the world shines in the mirror which is Bhairava. Abhinava suggests through the imagery of mirror that an individual does not see the self or the Lord directly, because neither is evident to the senses; and the world perceived as separate appearances is in fact a continuity as reflected through the senses in the homogeneous substance of the mind. The manner of seeing is like a reflection, and just as the universe is a reflection in the

[390] Liliane Silburn ed. and tr., *Le Paramārthasāra*, (Paris: E. De Boccard, 1957), p. 57 (text). My translation.

mirror of Bhairava, so Bhairava as the self is reflected in the mirror of the mind. The mirror, the substratum, is clear but holds and unifies images in itself; it is the conscious substance. Reflections in the mirror are cognitions, continuous because they are of the same substance and discontinuous because they appear to consist of disparate and external objects. And yet, consciousness, which is the agent of the manifesting mind, has no form apart from its reflection, namely, Speech.

The imagery is an expression of idealism. An existent is that of which mind is aware, and even the mind does not have direct access to the world, but perceives it through the medium of the senses. In chapter three of the *Tantrasāra,* Abhinava speaks of human perceptions of the world through the senses as a reflection, *pratibimba*: what I experience as taste is a mental event consisting of what the sense-organ of taste conveys by being in contact with an object appropriate to the sense. Experiences of the empirical world are "reflected" in "my" mind.[391]

Abhinava's idealism is qualified: external objects exist without being perceived by me, but their existence depends on some consciousness. If one accepts that there are other consciousnesses besides one's own and that there is a real, empirical world, then one must admit a unity of Consciousness by which all things and consciousnesses exist at all times.

> All this multitude of existents (*bhāvajāta*) are merely reflections in the sky of awareness, because they possess characteristics of reflections. For this is the characteristic of a reflection: that which is manifested as divided, which has no power, and which appears to be mixed with others,

[391] Abhinavagupta, *Tantrasāra of Abhinavagupt* (*TS*), edited with notes by Mukunda Ram Sastri (Repr. Delhi: Bani Prakasham, 1982), ch. 3, entire.

that is a reflection, like a face in the mirror, a taste in the saliva, scent in smelling.... Thus, just as this [world] appears as something reflected, just so the universe [appears as reflected] in the light of the Supreme Lord.

[Objection] In this connection, what would the original be? [Answer] Let it be nothing. [Objection] Then does it have no cause? So, then, it is a question of the cause--What use is the logic of talking about an original? The cause will be just the power of the Supreme Lord, which is synonymous with independence. Because the Lord bears the reflection of the universe, he is the universe. For the universe, consisting of [full] consciousness (*saṃvinmaya*), is the place of the manifestation of [limited] consciousness (*caitanya*). It is for that reason that the universe is in this case a reflection (*pratīpa*). Thus he bears the reflections. And thus, to begin with, the nature of the lord, the self of the universe, is not unreflected (*anāmṛṣṭa*).[392]

Therefore, to see the universe of diversity as a unity is to perceive that diversity is held together in the Consciousness of which my consciousness is a reflection. The mirror imagery suggests that the individual minds, when they perceive the world, reflect Śiva who unites all minds and all events, manifesting them in Himself. This is an interpretation of Abhinava's imagery of "reflection."

The passage above proceeds to say that this reflection (*āmarśa*), in the form of the Supreme Sound (*paranāda*), is innate to consciousness. The collection of powers of Śiva is the arranger of the world, and the powers (*śakti*) are the syllables. Arranged in various ways, they are the levels of awareness (*parāmarśa*) which, in the lower stages, are realms of elements (*tattva*), and worlds (*bhuvana*).

---

[392] *TS* 3, repr. of KSTS 17, p. 10-12. "*sarvam idaṃ bhāvajātam bodhagagane... parameśvarasya svarūpaṃ na anāmṛṣṭaṃ bhavati.*

The whole world shines within the self here,
just as various arrangements shine in the mirror.
An awareness (*bodha*), furthermore, through an unfolding of [one's]
essence in innate (*nija*) *vimarśa*,
reflects the universe, in the same way that a mirror [reflects]
us.[393]

Abhinava also speaks of rituals as the mirror of the self:

There, on a pleasant ground, he meditates on his very own form, like a spotless mirror. Having seen [his very own form], as if a reflected by an image (*mūrtibimbitam iva*), not different from the circle of deities to whom one ought to perform sacrifice, he should worship with lovely flowers, scents, drinks, libations, eatables, incense, lights (*dīpa*), oblations, songs, music, and dance, and so on; he should recite, and he should praise--to receive certain identity with Śiva (*tanmayībhāva*). For, one who looks at his own face in the mirror constantly should soon know it with certainty. In this case, no particular sequence is important, except for the identity with [Bhairava].[394]

Masson cites an instance where Abhinava compares the actor to the *Paramātman*.[395] The passage states that just as the Supreme Soul, even without leaving the light of his consciousness, mirrors (*ādarśayati*) his

[393] *TS* 3, p. 19. "*antarvibhāti sakalaṃ jagadātmanīha/ yadvad vicitraracanā mukurāntarāle// bodhaḥ paraṃ nijavimarśarasānuvṛttyā/ viśvaṃ parāmṛśati no mukuras tathā tu.*"

[394] *TS* ch. 20,(Delhi: Baniprakashan) 1982, p. 180 "*tatra hṛdaye sthaṇḍile vimalamakuravad dhyāte svam eva rūpaṃ yājyadevatācakrābhinnaṃ mūrtibimbitam iva dṛṣṭvā hṛdyapuṣpagandhāsavatarpaṇaivedyadhūpadīpopahāra-stutigītavādyanṛttādinā pūjayet, japet, stuvīta--tanmayībhāvāśaṅkitaṃ labdhum. ādarśe hi svamukham aviratam avalokayataḥ tatsvarūpaniścitiḥ acireṇaiva bhavet-- na cātra kaścit kramaḥ pradhānam--ṛte tanmayībhāvāt.*"

[395] Jeffrey Masson, *AR*, vol. 1, p. 36, vol. 2, n. 299, p. 50. Passage cited, *Abh.*, vol. 3, p. 124 (Baroda ed., 1954).

nature which seems to be tinged by mental states appropriate to the bodies and their sheaths, so, too, the actor, without leaving himself as the support, appropriately through the use of the dances and songs, and so on, shows himself to the spectator in such a way that he seems to be embraced (*āliṅgita*) by the nature appropriate to him, through his movements, costumes, and so on.

The actor is likened to Brahman because both conceal their identities under disguises as they generate seemingly real events that sway and beguile spectators. But again, to Abhinava, the actor is a vessel, a *pātra,* the vehicle or vessel for the audience's enjoyment of a *rasa.*[396] Abhinava does not mean that a cognition that penetrates theatrics and lays bare the true identity of the actor would lead us to the knowledge of the truth. He does not say that one comes face to face with the reality of the self. But the self is perceived in the midst of phenomena of one's own imagination, never directly. As the spectator savors the feeling of feelings in imagination, he retreats from external goals of objectification, drawing the world of Rāma and Sītā into his heart. This experience, enveloped by and contained in a purely subjective realm, whose aim and activity rest within oneself alone, is a repose in the self (*ātmaviśrānti*).

The term *saṃvid* describes consciousness that is aware of its object and itself through functions of illuminating and representing things as mental images. In the context of aesthetics, *saṃvid* is regularly used in connection with the production and enjoyment of a *rasa.* Abhinava says the spectator,

---

[396] *Abh.* 6, vol. 1, Nagar ed., p. 289. "*ata eva ca naṭe na rasaḥ kutra tarhi.. āsvādanopāyaḥ. ata eva ca pātram ity ucyate. na hi pātre madyāsvādaḥ. api tu tadupāyaksḥ.*"

as he puts himself in the exploits and feelings of Rāma, experiences a world delivered up in the manner of something devoured, a world of a generic type of *saṃvid*.[397] Speaking of theatrical universality which is not limited but extended, Abhinava tells us that a *rasa* thrives especially when the perception of the whole audience is as a single mass because trace impressions of all minds, made varied by beginningless impressions, are in sympathy; and this unobstructed consciousness (i.e. the imaginative expanse), *avighnā saṃvid*, is aesthetic wonderment.[398] The chief thing in this regard is the fact that some consciousnesses, *kāś cit saṃvidaḥ*, are the bases of human goal.[399] Or, Abhinava asks, whose consciousness rests in an unimportant object since an unimportant idea does not rest in itself as it runs after something else more important? Therefore, the insentient categories of *vibhāva* and *anubhāva* and the passing *vyabhicāribhāva*, although included in *saṃvid* by nature, are not important. The *sthāyin* is different from these. Therefore it is a vessel of relishing.[400] Abhinava

---

397 *Abh.* 1, vol. 1., Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 35. *evaṃkāriṇām idam iti śiḍhātmakavidhi samarpitaṃ saṃvijjātiyam imaṃ saṃvidviśeṣarañjakaprāṇavallabhāpratima-rasāsvādasahacararamyagītālodyādisaṃskārarasāvaśena... śubham ācaraty aśubhaṃ samujjhati.*

398 *Abh.* 6, vol. 1, Nagar ed., p. 278. *"evaṃ paro 'pi. tata eva na parimitam eva sādhāraṇyam. api tu vitatam... ata eva sarvasāmājikānām ekaghanatayaiva pratipatteḥ sutarāṃ rasaparipoṣāya. sarveṣām anādivāsanācitrīkṛtacetasāṃ vāsanāsaṃvādāt. sā cāvighnā saṃvic camatkāraḥ."*

399 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 280. *"tatra puruṣārthaniṣṭhāḥ kāścit saṃvida iti pradhānam."*

400 Ibid. *"apradhāne vastuni kasya saṃvid viśrāmyati. tasyaiva pratyayasya pradhānāntaraṃ pratyanudhāvataḥ svātmany aviśrāntatvāt. ato 'pradhānatvaṃ jaḍe vibhāvānubhāvavarge vyabhicārinicaye ca saṃvid ātmake 'pi niyamenānyamukha-*

speaks of savoring one's own *saṃvid* in the way that some women finds a repose in their heart by immersing herself in single mass of grief.[401] In another place, he calls *saṃvid* the permanent emotions that overpower creatures.[402]

If one interprets the act of savoring *rasa* merely as an apperception (*anuvyavasāya*) which is a mental operation (*mānasapratyakṣa* or *mānasavyāpāra*), and the *rasa* as an object to be realized in one's own consciousness (*svasaṃvedanasaṃvedya*), the term *saṃvid* may be understood simply as a passive consciousness, like Sāṃkhya's crystal (*sphaṭikamaṇi*) or Vedānta's Brahman. Examples above show that *saṃvid* actively governs objects and activities of theatrical elements, i.e., the *vibhāva* and *anubhāva*; sometimes it denotes particular states of consciousness. It is, therefore, proper to attribute to the term *saṃvid* that we find in Abhinava's literary criticism the same meanings as in his theory of cognition. In this sense, consciousness in which the *rasa* is realized is active. It possesses projecting and reflecting aspects; it is free and sovereign in its power to represent mental images. Consciousness illuminates its objects. In the process of representation, it combines sense percepts with elements of memory in the subconscious. The determinate representation that follows occurs in consciousness's reflective function (*vimarśa*) in the form of Speech, through intuition--the power to create anew--excluding what the object is not and determining what it is.

---

saṃprekṣiṇi saṃbhavatīti. tadatiriktaḥ sthāyy eva tathācarvaṇāpātram."

401 Ibid. "*tatra sarve 'mī sukhapradhānāḥ. svasaṃviccarvaṇarūpasyaikaghanasya prakāśasyānandarasatvāt."*

402 *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., p. 281. "*sthāyitvaṃ caitāvatām eva. jāta eva hi jantur iyatībhiḥ saṃvidbhiḥ parīto bhavati."*

Of the ultimate *rasa,* the *sthāyin* is so permanent and enduring that all other permanent emotions are transient.[403] Abhinava says that the self shines through. The *sthāyin* of *śāntarasa* is the soul; and the knowledge of this *sthāyin* is the knowledge of the truth, which is the knowledge of the self. All emotions dissolve in and issue from the self, which is the screen on which all other emotional states are projected.[404] He describes in the following way how one may have an experience of the soul:

> What is the savoring of its truth like? It is said: the self itself is colored by zeal, love, and so on, that bestow colorings. That very self appears as a bright, white string that shows through in the intervals between gems that cover it, shining even as the truth among all the colorings such as love, and so on, in such a way that the perception "this is the self" flashes out suddenly. It lacks the web of all miseries in being dependent on others. Shining forth universally as the result of a composition and performance of poetry, as the unity of *saṃvid* which is the attainment of the supreme bliss, [the self] turns the heart to look toward a supramundane bliss without rupture with an inward-looking state.[405]

An experiencer of any *rasa* s tastes the flavors of feelings and sees colorings of his inner world. But there is no color for the peaceful. T. E.

---

[403] *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 331. : "*tattvajñānaṃ tu sakalabhāvāntarabhittisthānīyaṃ sarvasthāyibhyaḥ stāyitaṃ..*."

[404] *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 331. "*tenātmaiva jñānānandādiviśuddhadharmayogī parikalpitaviṣayoparāgarahito'tra sthāyī.*" "Therefore, that self, provided with pure qualities of knowledge and bliss, and so on, and lacking in colorations of mentally constructed objects, is the permanent emotion." "*tattvajñānaṃ tu sakalabhāvāntarabhittisthānīyaṃ sarvasthāyibhyaḥ sthāyitamam.*" "But the knowledge of the truth (i.e., the self) standing for the screen of all other emotions, is the most permanent of all permanent emotions."

[405] *Abh* 6, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 335.

Lawrence once says of the desert: it has no taste.

Imagination seeks to act on no goal beyond itself: in viewing the workings of one's own heart and mind, the seer is a creator who takes pleasure in the independence and sovereignty of his creations. If the Śaivas say that Śiva is the dancer who dances out creation on the screen of his own being, the spectator in his limited way weaves the world of illusions out of the senses and traces impressions of beginingless experiences. The Lord dances according to his will, and in the real world humans act in conformity with Śiva's imaginations that create new images of the world with every moment. In the theater, the spectators dance to the stimuli in a world created by the poet and the actor; and for the duration of the drama the audience are bound together as one mind, or as one universe analogous to that created by Śiva. The world of the theater in its way is like the universe in which all creatures dance with the dance of Śiva.

The self that reflects Śiva, i.e., acts as creator of images, is Śiva. So the Śaivas mean when they say, "I am Śiva." The self is not an object, and is not manifested in experience. The repose in the self (*ātmaviśrānti*) is the ultimate substratum. To experience the *ātman* is just to be in the *ātman.* Indeed the Śaivas seek the *ātman* as if to catch the fleeting wind. Thinking that it is, as Abhinava describes, in the interstices of experience, they enjoy heightened experiences in order to catch the bright white consciousness in between. The origin of this metaphor can be seen, for example, in the *Spandakārikā,* exhorting followers to find and hold on to the *nirvikalpa* consciousness, riding on the waves (*spanda*) of one's own volitions and seeking to be delivered to waves of universal volition, moving the world in

pulses of consciousness.[406] Words are a bondage: ordinary language is the fetter that ties cattle to *saṃsāra;* but pure and subtle language in its original power, is the link to pure consciousness.[407]

In the context of the theater, we see that Abhinava's linking of the poetic language, embodied by the actor's dramatic presentation, to the soul, is constructed equally on traditions of poetics and dramatics as on Śaiva philosophy.

The situation seems to have been that at the height of the power of Kashmirian kings and the most culturally and intellectually productive

---

406 Kallaṭa, *Spanda-Kārikās: The Divine Creative Pulsation* (*SK*), with the *Spandanirṇaya* Commentary of Kṣemarāja, Jaideva Singh, tr. (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980). See verses 1.8, p. 57. "*na hicchānodanasyāyaṃ prerakatvena vartate/ api tv ātmabalasparśāt puruṣas tat samo bhavet.*" "For a person does not impel the urgings of desire, but rather he may be equal to that [activity] from a touch of the power of the self." The following verses in chapter one teaches that when an individual, frustrated by a desire and an inability to do things, abandons himself to his innate nature and becomes one with the *spanda,* he will naturally know and do what is desired. (pp. 61-71) Language can bind and makes a person a beast (*paśu*) 3.,13, p.153, 3.15-16, pp. 162-164, because it gives rise to constructed thoughts. But when joined with the *spanda,* he is the master of the *śakti*s, i.e. the phonemes: 3.19, p. 170.

407 Vasugupta. *Śiva Sūtras: The Yoga of Supreme Identity* (*Śs*). With the *Vimarśinī* Commentary of Kṣemarājā, translated with introduction, notes, exposition, glossary and index by Jaideva Singh (Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982 [1st edition 1979]). See 1.2, p. 16. "*jñānaṃ bandhaḥ*" "Knowledge is bondage." 1.4, p. 25. "*jñānādhiṣṭhānaṃ mātṛkā*" "The Mother (i.e., the set of phonemes that are the alphabet) is the basis of knowledge." But from the grace of a teacher, there is an awakening to the circle of phonemes, 2.7, p. 104 "*mātṛkācakrasaṃbodhaḥ.*" The seeker gains mastery over his worldly condition. 2.9, p. 120. "*jñānaṃ annam.*"" Knowledge is food." In the *SK, and Śs, śakti* is regularly taken to be the set of phonemes by which ideas are formed. The *Śs* also says that the self is the dancer, the mind the theater, and the senses are the spectators. 3.9-11, pp. 152-156. "*nartaka ātmā*" "*raṅgo 'ntarātmā*" "*prekṣakāṇīndriyāṇi.*"

period of the kingdom, there were within a period of a few hundred years flourishing activities among poets and poeticians. Drama and poetry, which were allied arts and had always treated emotional topics and exploited the suggestive functions of language, at that time became subjected to schools of literary criticism that sought after a wider explanations for the causes of beauty in poetry. This intellectual expansion can be accounted for, perhaps, by the prevailing scholarly and philosophical interests, especially in grammar at the court of the kings of Kashmir.[408] In society, sectarian groups seemed to be active in propagating and furthering the beliefs of their sects.[409] The question of the soul which had been kept outside the realm of poetic criticism was brought into it; and from that introduction, various metaphysical and religious views were annexed in providing a broad, logical and psychological basis for investigating the causes of poetic beauty.

Bhaṭṭanāyaka, as quoted by Abhinavagupta, seems to have been intent on elevating the aesthetic experience to a transcendent level, and Abhinavagupta, while bringing Nāyaka back into the world, asserts that the soul is manifest in the *śāntarasa*. An analysis of perceptions would naturally

[408] See *RT*, fourth book and fifth books. Account of scholars at Jayāpīḍa's court, 4.488-499.

[409] See Alexis Sanderson, "Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions," in *The World's Religions*, Stewart Sutherland, et al., eds (London: Routledge, 1988). Kalhaṇa's in reporting the loyalty of minister Śūra to king Avantivarman seems to account for their rapport in part by the fact that they minimized their religious differences. *RT* 5.43, p. 191. "The king, who conformed to the pleasures of his minister as [if it were that] of a deity, bore himself [outwardly] as a worshipper of Śiva, though he was [in reality] from childhood a worshipper of Viṣṇu." *RT* 5.124, p. 202 "Having there become certain of his [near] death, he disclosed to *Śūra*, at the end of his life and with folded hands, his attachment to the worship of Viṣṇu, which he had long hidden." This episode seems to indicate that sectarianism was a significant social and political factor.

lead to questions of their ultimate basis. It seems inevitable that aestheticians, in bringing literary criticism under a general discussion of metaphysics, would describe an aesthetic experience as sublime because it is enjoyed above and beyond sensory pleasures. Sublimation implies a moral hierarchy--the placement of values in a vertical order of goodness. This hierarchy readily exists in the four goals of human life, and a value relative to liberation is conceived for an aesthetic experience as for other kinds of knowledge leading to higher moral purposes.

Both Nāyaka and Abhinava are fully aware of differences between the experiences of yogis and those of an aesthetically sensitive audience. Although an enjoyment of a *rasa* is blissful, unlike anything in the world and comparable only to the bliss of a mystical experience, there is obviously much less at stake in going to the theater than becoming an ascetic or a renunciant (*sannyāsin*). The ease of an enjoyment of a *rasa* is matched by its short-lived existence: it is created in the theater only, and although it may leave trace impressions (*saṃskāra*), the experience itself does not last beyond the duration of the theater. The approach toward a larger metaphysical picture attests to a desire to provide a theoretical continuity between one kind of elevated, extraordinary perception and another. In the case of Abhinavagupta, for whom continuity between the most minimal to the most exalted experiences exists in the unity of *saṃvid*, there is no interruption between an ordinary and a transcendent experience. Each experience is a dialectic of the one and the many, a relation between an image-forming unity of consciousness and its innate Speech (*vāc*) that gives consciousness its form of diversity.

Seeing language as extrinsic as do Mīmāṃsakas, or as intrinsic as do Bhartṛhari and the Tantrikas, effects the ordering of authoritativeness and hierarchy of objects in experience.[410] Thus, Sanderson perceives the phenomenon of the expansion of Tantrism among householder Brahmins as a conflict of values. This tension occurs between the Mīmāṃsaka ritualism, rendering a person an object of scriptural injunctions, and Tantric ritualism, seeking to restore a sense of individual identity and power. Sanderson writes,

> First, the Mīmāṃsaka ritualists, specialists in the interpretation of the Vedic texts as the sole authority for the duties of the twice-born, required the orthodox person to recognize as his a world in which all form is external to consciousness. He was not to view ideas and language as a field of internal construction, an inner depth coming between him and the world in itself. For such a formulation would have undermined his realism, causing him to doubt whether he was in fact in contact with an external world at all.[411]

Of a Tantrika's objective in meditating on sensual images, Sanderson writes,

> His idealism in the Tantric domain was the evocation of an omnipotent, all-containing identity immune to this self-imposed tyranny of extrinsicist inhibition.[412]

---

[410] On language and authoritativeness, see in general, Madeleine Biardeau, *Théorie de la connaissance et philsophie de la parole dans le brahmanisme classique*, Le Monde d'outre-mer passé et Présent, première série, 23 (Paris: Mouton & co., 1964).

[411] Alexis Sanderson, "Purity and power among the Brahmans of Kashmir," in *The Category of the Persons: Philosophical and Anthropological Perspectives* (Steve Lukes et al., eds., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 193.

[412] Alexis Sanderson, "Purity and Power," p. 200.

Tantric initiation and meditation, completely guided by the teacher's instructions, are processes of intense imaginative activity by which, according to Sanderson, the individual reasserts his absolute agency over his mental projections. We see a structural similarity between an aesthetic imagination and a Tantric ritual imagination as described by the same author:

> Daily recreating the maṇḍala in mental worship he summons from within his consciousness the deities it enthrones, projecting them on to a smooth mirror-like surface to contemplate them there as the reflection of his internal, Āgamic identity.[413]

Sanderson shows, in fact, that

> Possession (*samāveśa*) is the absence of this subordination of one's essence to these projections. It is, says Utpaladeva, the state in which the pure agency of consciousness reasserts itself within them, revealing their dependence upon it.[414]

In poetics, the term *āveśa* is used by Abhinavagupta in a way that recalls the idea and process of possession. A *rasāveśa,* for example, is a state of mind overwhelmed by a *rasa,* and the entrance of *rasa* is an intense absorption experienced as a gapless unity of consciousness by the

---

[413] Alexis Sanderson, "Maṇḍala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir," ("Maṇḍala") in *Mantras et Diagrammes Rituels dans l'Hindouisme* (Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 1986), pp. 169-70.

[414] Alexis Sanderson, "Maṇḍala," p. 176.

subject. Possession is an imagination of certain fixed images, serving the purpose of seeing the self reflected in the conscious mind.[415] The single-pointed experience of *rasa* is an apperception in the sense that imagination, colored by dramatic stimuli, is enjoyed by and as an innermost awareness. Resting on this sustratum of *saṃvid,* aesthetic imagination is untouched by time and space parameters orienting it to any other purpose except bliss, *camatkāra* or *ānanda*.

Abhinava conceives of such a bliss essentially as the wonder and amazement of self-consciousness (*camatkāra*), which he represents by the phrase, "I am the light in that light," "*aham evaṃ prakāśātmā prakāśe* "[416] In *IPVV* 1.5.11, he alludes to different kinds of perceptual wonderment, (*camatkāra*) :

> But in relishing the taste of honey, and so on, there is an intervention of the object's influence. Therefore, even in poetry and drama, and so on, there is an absence of that [an object's influence], but there is a piercing through (*anuvedha*) of trace impressions. But even there [in poetry and drama], those whose hearts are intent on dispelling every bit of intervention arising in that way truly receive the highest bliss.[417]

The realization of one's own absolute agency, i.e. that "I am Śiva," is founded on the supposition that language is the constant accompaniment of consciousness, of Śiva as of everyman; and that the individual mind which reflects the seething soul is the reflection of the universe that reflects Śiva's irrepressibly energetic playfulness. If one agrees with Sanderson[418] that

---

[415] Cf. above, n. 394.

[416] *IPV* 1.51.11, vol. 1, p. 243. Or, "Being light, I illuminate."

[417] *IPVV* 1.5, vol. 2, p. 179. "*madhurādirasāsvāde tu... labhanta eva paramānandam.*"

[418] Alexis Sanderson, "Purity and power among the Brahmans of Kashmir," p. 191:

Śaiva Tantrikas, such as Utpaladeva and Abhinava, were responsible for domesticating radical asceticism and routinizing it among Kashmirian Brāhmanic householders, it will not be an overstatement to say that the process of making *śākta* practices meaningful in the Brāhmanic worldview relies in many ways on Bhartṛhari's theory of language and metaphysics. Although the linkage between Bhartṛhari to the esoteric and sectarian traditions remains ambiguous,[419] the notion that *vāc* as the consort of Prajāpati is the connecting link between humans to the cosmos through *mantra*, is a well-known phenomenon of the Hindu and Vedic world-views.[420] Possibilities for feminizing the verbal aspect of consciousness, making it powerful independently of Brahman, can be seen in Bhartṛhari's statements describing Speech (*vāc*) as the form and the binder of consciousness whose essence is Brahman. Such possibilities are especially marked in passages that institute *pratibhā* as an ontological real: by following Speech to its source, one comes upon the ultimate origin (*parāprakṛti*);[421] those who know Speech, by purifying it and cutting the

"Nowhere else at any time did this fundamental element in Indian society find so articulate a voice, and as it grows in strength we witness the strategies by which certain groups within these radical sects were brought in from the visionary fringe to accommodate areas of orthodox self-representation." And "Śaivism and the Tantric Tradition," pp. 661-662.

419 See D. Seyfort Ruegg, *Contributions*, entire. It seems, however, that *śāktism* predates Bhartṛhari, and Ruegg points out possible connections between them.

420 An exposition of the heart as the seat of *mantra* in Abhinavagupta's work, the *Parātrṃśikalaghuvṛtti*, is found in Paul Muller-Ortega, *The Triadic Heart of Śiva: Kaula Tantricism of Abhinavagupta in the Non-dual Shaivism of Kashmir* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1989).

421 *VP* 1.14, *vṛtti*, DCMS 32, p. 48.

knots of multiplicity, go to its original source and become one with the self, the great soul, who is the Bull of the Word (*śabdavṛṣabha*).[422] These passages treat *śabdabrahman* and *pratibhā* effectively as two entities that are ultimate sources of language. And we see in āgamic Tantric texts, viewing the world as composed of the god and his consort, depictions of the latter as the power (*śakti*) which is Speech (*vāc*).

Grammar is the means of purifying defects of Speech, leading to the original and undivided state of Speech in which thought and words are inseparable. In *VP* 1.131, Bhartṛhari describes the process of coming up to the origin of changes of states as ascending to intuition, whose cause is reality (*tattvaprabhava*): a person who understands this Being (i.e., intuition) which is provided with the power to achieve an end (*sattāṃ sādhyasādhanaśaktiyuktāṃ*)[423] attains felicitude. In the accompanying verse, Bhartṛhari says that in order to reach the inner light of unity, the knot of egoity has to be cut. The knot, we recall from *VP* 1.4, is the knot of perception in the subjective/objective mode by which the idea of the "I" arises. Reaching Brahman is simply the cutting of the knots of egoity.[424] Bhartṛhari associates, if not equates, the knots of subjective-objective experience with differentiation of the unity into diversity, which is Speech. He restates the knot-cutting idea, which is an attainment of the original unity of consciousness, in a supporting verse,

vācaḥ saṃskāram ādhāya vācaṃ jñāne niveśya ca

422 *VP* 1.130-131, DCMS 32, pp. 191-203.

423 *VP* 1.130-131, DCMS 32, p. 202.

424 *VP* 1.5, DCMS 32, p. 22, "*mamāhaṃ ityahaṃkāragranthisamatikramamātraṃ brahmaṇaḥprāptiḥ.*"

vibhajya bandhanāny asyāḥ kṛtvā tāṃ chinnabandhanām
jyotir āntaram āsādya chinnagranthiparigrahaḥ
pareṇa jyotiṣaikatvaṃ chitvā granthīn prapadyate.[425]

Having purified Speech, and having placed Speech in knowledge,
Having separated its bindings, and having made its bondage severed,
Having come near the inner light, he who has severed the hold of knots,
Having cut the knots, becomes one with the highest light.

Passages such as this express ambivalent values of Speech as the form of diversity, which is the basis of worldly life and communication on the one hand, and as the binder to that life and to one's egoity which must be cut off in order to regain unity. In Abhinavagupta, we find the same sentiment realized in differentiating *vāc* into the conventional, artificial language and the real or Tantric language. The first, used in the world, binds humans to the world of *saṃsāra*; the subtle language creates the world and leads back to the all-powerful subject.

Conclusion: *Pratibhā* and its scope

Abhinava's concept of *pratibhā,* in various contexts, possesses shades of meanings blending philosophy, aesthetics and religion into one another. When he speaks of intuition in poetry and the theater, it is understood that the depths of poetic meanings can be realized and savored because humans, as poets and audience, have a god-like creative capacity. Creative power, furthermore, is full of desires, feelings and caprice that are characteristically Śiva's way of being. When Abhinava speaks purely of cognition in an

[425] *VP* 1.131, DCMS 32, p. 203.

epistemological context, he calls the cognitive process an original creation (i.e., making what has not existed before, *apūrvanirmāṇa*) and describes cognitions as tinged and colored by various empirical (*padārtha*) and psychic (*saṃskāra*) things. Bringing these ideas into literary criticism, he sees that the imagination as projected intuitively onto the mirror of the mind is not different from the imagination by which a seeker looks for the absolute in the mirror of his ritual experiences. The self that one comes to see is the same in all cases because the substance, and the matrix, of experiences is one only: there can be none but one creator who spins the yarn of realities as of illusions. Everything is illusion, and everything is reality. One can see, not directly but in reflections of one's thoughts and feelings, the self that ordains experiences and which is the source and criterion of all relative conditions of reality.

In several major works of Abhinavagupta, *pratibhā* is prominently mentioned in the beginning. We find it in the *Tantrāloka* 1.2, 3.66, 10.78-79, and expounded in a detailed hierarchical classification in chapter thirteen. In the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* and the *Vivṛtivimarśinī*, it appears in verse 1.1.[426] His works on poetics contain references to intuition early on: it appears in the *Locana* at 1.1, although Ānanda does not mention it until verse 1.6, and in the concluding verse of the first *uddyota*. In the *Abhinavabhāratī* Abhinava alludes to it in chapter 1. In the *Parātṛṃśikāvivaraṇa*, *pratibhā* appears in the commentary of verses 5-9 as *nirvikalpasaṃvid*.

426 *DhāL* 1.1., VSS 97, p. 28. "*vāgvikalpāḥ vāgpravṛttihetupratibhāvyāpāra-prakārā iti vā*"

The thread running through the concept of intuition in all these works is, first, a glorification of the creative power of Maheśvara, which power is the goddess, God's constant companion: she encompasses all creations that are the Lord's imaginations.[427] She is *parā vāk devī,* who herself radiates into potent sounds; she is the real and uncreated Speech, independent of convention. In the multivalent senses of the word, the fecund Mother (*kaulikī*) is not separable from the ordinary intuitions: every insight seems imbued with this original empowering.

In Abhinava's conception, *pratibhā* is valid knowledge, or the means of valid knowledge, because it is unerring, and creative. Harold Coward likens the authoritativeness in Bhartṛhari's notion of intuition to Kālidāsa's exemplification of the same concept in the *Śakuntalā* : King Duṣyanta has certain intuition that the young ascetic (*tapasvinī*) is a fitting wife for him.[428] Abhinava takes *pratibhā* in its highest degree of sotereological efficacy to be the great knowledge that the self is bondage and liberation; this intuition occurs to one without scholarly or preceptorial instruction. It is said in chapter thirteen of the *Tantrāloka*:

---

427 Ahinavagupta, *Tantrāloka,* vols 1-8, with the commentary of Jayaratha, edited by R. C. Dwived and Navjivan Rastogi (Enlarged ed., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987 [1st ed., KSTS, 1918-1938]). Jayaratha in the commentary of *TĀ* 1.2, vol. 2, p. 17, calls her "desireness of [the Lord] who desires to create.

428 Coward, Harold G. *Sphoṭa Theory of Language* (*Sphoṭa*). Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986 [1st edition, 1980], p. 124. "Not only is it the source of all popular word usage, but, according to Kālidāsa, *pratibhā* is all that function of the mind that provides the strong guiding principle when one finds oneself in the midst of doubts as to the right course of action to follow." After an explanation of *pratibhā* by P. K. Chakravati, *The Linguistic Speculations of the Hindus.* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1933), pp. 113-115.

Because, just in and by himself, he knows that the self is bondage
and liberation,
that is the great, intuitive knowledge, which does not depend
on book-learning (*śāstra*) and teachers.[429]

Unlike Śaṅkara's sudden and undifferentiated *prātibhāsikajñānam,* Abhinava allows that there are gradations of intuition and that it can be taught:

That light of gradation consists of the intense, medium, and slow
states.
These very states of grace each abide in three ways. The very intense
fall of grace from the force of the fall of one's own body (i.e. death).
Or, that which bestows liberation at that time or at another time by
degree. Because it is middling intense, still, it checks ignorance.
The moon of a teacher, whose rays of intuition calms the night,
destroys ignorance and pain, causing to shine forth a sight full of
joy.[430]

Its strength can increase with attention and practice, and it is useful for life in the world:

The more the [phoneme's] uncreated form is discerned,
the higher gradations of self-wonderment are brought forth.

[429] *TĀ* 13.132, vol. 5, p. 2287. "*svayam eva yato vetti/ bandhamokṣatayātmatām/ tatprātibhaṃ mahājñānaṃ/ śāstrācāryānapekṣi yat*."

[430] *TĀ* 13. 120-249, vol. 5, pp. 2283-2354. These verses contain a discussion of kinds of liberating intuition, which Abhinava also calls *śaktipāta,* and the teachers. 13.129 *tāratamyaprakāśo yas tīvramadyamamandataḥ//* 13.130 *tā eva śaktipātasya pratyekaṃ traidham āsthitāḥ//* 13.131 *mokṣapradas tadaivānya/ kāle vā tāratamyataḥ/ madhyatīvrāt punaḥ sarvam ajñānaṃ vinivartate.* 13.133. *pratibhācandrikāśāntadhvāntaś cācāryacandramāḥ/ tamastāpau hanti dṛśaṃ visphāryānandanirbharām.*

> Conventional language being inwardly [i.e. psychically] submerged
> further and further back in the first, non-dual phonemes,
> those who have a variety of intuitions in the conventional
> language, steeped in its more and more primordial portions,
> who rest on intuition itself, abounding in its original power,
> quickly become skilled as poets and speakers in every way.[431]

This trust in the intuitive is founded on Bhartṛhari's thought that intuition supersedes other kinds of knowledge as a means of valid knowledge. It has been shown previously that for the grammarian, intuition is an apprehension of the sentence-meaning, going beyond the grammatical relations of expressor and expressed to link a linguistic meaning with reality. And because the use of language in the world has arisen in two ways, from the Veda on the one hand and with the linguistic principle inherent in consciousness on the other, all knowledge woven on the fabric of language as used to communicate ideas in an individual's mind, is intertwined with the Veda as its origin.

If language structures thought, it does so not only through its main grammatical efficiencies (*śakti*) of form (*mūrti*) and action (*kriyā*) that order time, space and relations in thought; but also through the way that scripture, and the arts and sciences that have developed around and in consequence of it, has conditioned the content of thought. Every form of

---

[431] *TĀ* 11.76-79, vol. 5, pp. 2152-2154. "*yathā yathā cākṛtakaṃ/ tadrūpam atiricyate// tathā tathā camatkāra-/tāratamyaṃ vibhāvyate// ādyāmāyīyavarṇāntarnimagne cottarottare// saṃkete pūrvapūrvāṃśa-/majjane pratibhābhidaḥ/ ādyodrekamahattve 'pi pratibhātmani niṣṭhitāḥ// dhruvaṃ kavitvavaktṛtva-/śālitāṃ yānti sarvataḥ.*" These verses are found in almost exactly repeated in the *Mālinīvijayottaravārttika* 1.1031-1032, Madhusudan Kaul Shastri, ed., KSTS 32 (Srinagar: Jamu and Kashmir State), p.94.

conduct and way of thinking, even seemingly immediate and fresh, is inevitably colored by traces of tradition. Tradition [*āgama* i.e., scripture and its major and minor limbs] is continuous as consciousness itself.[432]

The value of an intuition that appears original and new is rooted in and co-extensive with the value of tradition that is beginningless. The intuitive, in the narrowest sense of an apprehension of a *vākyārtha,* apprehends a meaning which is an idea of an external object (*pratyaya*)[433] as well as an object (*vastu*).[434] Although the primary Brahman-world may be homogeneous, the use and apprehension of a linguistic expression in ordinary reality --precisely the fact that language is the form of knowledge[435]--entail a complex of factors: the material world on which word-meanings are imposed, the fact that it is perceptible to the senses with which they are in a relation of fitness, the nature of determinate and indeterminate cognitions, psychic factors such as trace impressions, memory

---

[432] *VP* 1.42, DCMS 32, p. 98.

[433] *VP* 1.23 *vṛtti*: "*indriyaviṣayavad vā prakāśyaprakāśakabhāvena samayopādhir yogyatā śabdārthayoḥ sambandhaḥ. arthasarūpapratyavabhāsānām pratyayānām bāhyeṣv artheṣu pratyastānām akṣaranimittākṣarakalpanāvad arthavad evaikaviṣayatve 'bhyupagamyamāne nityam avicchinnapāramparyaḥ kāryakāraṇabhāvaḥ śabdārthayoḥ sambandhaḥ.*" "Or, like a sense and its object, the relation of a word and its meaning is a fitness by being a light and the illuminated, on which [fitness] time is superimposed. It being accepted that ideas, manifesting together with the forms of things cast upon external things, have one object, like a meaning (*artha*) which is caused by the letters and mentally composed through letters, the relation between a word and its meaning is eternal, being a cause and effect relation having an uninterrupted continuity."

[434] *VP* 1.123 "*vastvātmā jñānānugato vyaktarūpapratyavabhāso jñāyata ity abhidhīyate.*" "It is said that the thing itself, conforming to knowledge and appearing in a clear form, is known.

[435] *VP* 1.124, DCMS p. 190.

and feelings, the body of knowledge based communication (*vyavahāra*) which is bounded and increased by language, and, finally, conventions which are made of language and based on language.

Bhartṛhari says that a sentence-meaning is an intuition: the efficiencies residing in words and binding the whole [expressor-expressed relationship][436] are eyes through which an intuition arises. The sentence meaning in this case is not a derivation of a series of word meanings, which may be gained in a translation (*anuvāda*) or a paraphrase (*samākhyeya*), by substituting synonyms for terms in the original sentence.[437] In fact, Bhartṛhari says that a meaning cannot be repeated, which is to say that it cannot be restated in another way without the use of another, similar sentence. An intuition of the meaning encompasses a complex of factors mentioned above, entailed by the use of language of which a sentence is a complete unit of communication.

To reconsider *VP* 1.118, *"śabdeṣv evāśritā śaktir viśvasyāsya nibandhanī/ yannetraḥ pratibhātmāyam bhedarūpaḥ pratīyate,"* the efficiencies, eyes of intuition, are the binders, therefore, not of word meanings alone but of the whole, *viśva*-- the complex of accountable and unaccountable elements in the active consciousness and its activities, a unity that becomes diverse in the form of language through the binding

[436] See Raghunath Śarma's commentary of *VP* 118. Raghunath Śarma, *Vākyapadīyam,* with the *Ambākartrī* commentary, Sarasvatī Bhavan Sanskrit Series 91, (Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1976), p. 170-72)

[437] See John Brough, "Some Indian Theories of Meaning," p. 420. "If on this analogy we proceed to explain the sentence on the basis of an analysis into words, we are in fact merely giving the commentary on it in what are ultimately other words, not words of the sentence itself."

efficiencies of words. The unity of intuition is perceived, whose appearance consists of differences, precisely through the binding efficiencies of words. Efficiencies combined are a complex, a whole that is understood at once. And an intuition coming to mind in a moment branches out in different images in awareness, through the efficiencies of words that communicate and expand it in a sequential linguistic form.

Intuition, although a flash of understanding, is not empty. Just as the seers' insight into unity is divided into many and proliferates into all learnings, and just as *prakṛti* evolves into the world, a flash of insight becomes diverse in form. Every insight is based on every other insight before it, of which scripture is the most continuous, original and basic. The superiority of scripture as the means of knowledge of *dharma* rests on the spiritual excellence of their teachers who have direct intuitions of reality. Bhartṛhari describes intuition in *kāṇḍa* 2 of the *VP*:

> Just as in ordinary discourse people cannot repeat meanings,
> so a wise person should not think to repeat them.
>
> Another intuition of meanings arises in grasping a discrete thing.
> They call it a sentence-meaning created by word-meanings.
>
> [The intuition,] "It is this," can in no way be paraphrased by others.
> Functioning in each soul, it occurs to the knower and even he
> cannot describe it.
>
> It is not thought out and seems to associate meanings.
> Becoming as if the whole, it exists as the object.
>
> Produced by a direct word or by following an instinct,
> no one gainsays it as the way to act.

> The whole world agrees that it is a valid means of knowledge.
> It is known that even animals behave under its power.
>
> Just as qualities of matter arise effortlessly when they ripen, just
> so intuitions of those who have it are seen to be slow and so on.
>
> For, who makes the male cuckoo warble in spring?
> Who taught creatures to build their nests?
>
> Who urges wild animals to take joy in food, to fight or swim--
> behaviors known at birth by their offsprings?
>
> This arises from tradition, accompanied by a natural disposition,
> but tradition is distinguished by proximity or remoteness.
>
> They know that by applying practice in one's natural walk of life,
> intuition is visibly perfected and brought to excellence.[438]

The larger sense of intuition is founded on revelation,[439] which is an imitation, *anukāra,* of Brahman. The Veda ramified in remote and proximate relations to various humans propels them to right actions in varying degrees, as opposed to natural disposition such as Speech and the instinct of animals that impel them to behave instinctively. The Veda is the intuition of sages who perceived *sattā.* Each individual's insight approximates this reality, and other, lesser seers increase learning through their insights.[440]

---

438 *VP* 2.142-152, Abhyankar and Limaye, eds., p. 28

439 There is the revelation of Brahman in the intuition of the *ṛṣi*s, and the rendition of intuition by them into sequential Speech for the sake of revelation, *abhivyaktinimittāt,* to other humans who do not see dharmas directly. See *VP* 1.5, DCMS 32, p. 25 "*sa maharṣibhir bhedenābhedasya pratipādayitum aśakyatvād abhivyaktinimittāl labdhakrame vāgātmarūpe prāpita....*"

In this sense, Bhartṛhari intimates that knowledge is cumulative, and similarly one's perception becomes more acute with experience and practice.[441] The fruition of one's insights may seem slow at first, but it is certain, like instincts. Perhaps Bhartṛhari equates innateness with inevitability, in the manifestation of Brahman, or transformations in *prakṛti,* and ripening of substances: all proceeds from an original nature and takes its course. Like instinctive behavior, or scripture with the traditions based on it, intuition is a natural outcome that proceeds from accountable and unaccountable factors of things that are intertwined with and underlaid by the Word. Its sources are pervasive but invisible. Intuition, with world-binding efficiencies of words as its eyes is perceived in an appearance of differences: founded on the most traditional but fundamental substrata of the mind and society, it produces anew.

Abhinava likes to introduce *pratibhā* early in his works, perhaps in an act of devotion to *devī,* who holds the birth of creations within herself. In *TĀ,* 1.2 he honors the goddess,

> I bow to the Supreme Goddess, the intuition which is consciousness,
> the companion of Bhairava,
> making her abode on the lotus-trident whose parts are the
> cognizer, cognizing and cognition.[442]

---

440 *VP* 1.137, DCMS 32, pp. 226-227.

441 *VP* 1.35, DCMS 35, p. 93. "*pareṣām asamākhyeyam abhyāsād eva jāyate/ maṇirūpyādivijñānaṃ tadvidāṃ nānumānikam.*" "Not explainable to others, it arises from practice; the knowlede of gems and gold coins, and so on, of those who know them, is not inferential."

442 *TĀ* 1.2, vol. 1, p. 16.

In *TĀ* 3.66 he describes her:

She who is his independence from others (*ananyāpekṣitā*),
the Lord's immanence (*viśvātmatva*),
they call her Goddess, the supreme intuition
The Unsurpassable.[443]

Abhinavagupta provides a psychological explanation for the Tantric quest:

Indeterminate consciousness (*nirvikalpa saṃvid*) is that which by its efficacy (*sāmarthya*) brings something within comprehension which by its subsequent suitability for a particular purpose (*arthakriyā-yogyatādivaśa*) finally acquires confirmation as a state of the Self and thus receives firm concurrence which precedes all successive determinate perceptions like blue etc., which are considered to be mutually incompatible (*virodhāvabhāsisaṃmatakramikavikalpyamānanīlādiniṣṭa-vikalpa-purva-bhāvi*) and pervades undivided all those blue, yellow perceptions etc. which are admitted incompatible (*tattadvikalpanīyaviruddhābhimata-nīlapītādyābhāsavibhāgi bhavati*), as for example in the integral perception of a picture (in which the difference of the various parts is not marked), or in the integral perception of one standing on top of a hill (*śikharastha*) or the integral perception of a peacock's tail.[444]

Determinate perceptions, however, rise and fall in the continuous substratum of indeterminate consciousness which has the power, the freedom to engender thoughts, and possess the store of conventional signs that compose conscious awarenesses. Abhinava continues:

---

443 *TĀ* 3.66, vol. 2, p. 423.

444 Jaideva Singh, tr., *Abhinavagupta: Parātrīṃśikāvivaraṇa: The Secret of Tantric Mysticism* (Benares: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988), pp. 92-93

Thus the one divine indeterminate consciousness (*pratibhā*) defined by my weighty statement is of this kind i.e. of unlimited nature, the very Self of all. Not only in the beginning and the end but in the intervening state also, she is the origin of the emergence of the other present, past and future determinate apprehensions. Those who are adept in discrimination have experienced *ālaya-vijñāna* i.e. unified or integral knowledge in this very way (i.e. in the way of indeterminate consciousness.).[445]

In the introductory verse of the *IPV*, Abhinava explains *pratibhā* as follows:

Reflection by means of one's own words is reasonable because it benefits all people; for it goes instantly into the heart of everyone. But an implied meaning [goes to the heart] of some people only, because [others] lack the reflection of the essence of Speech rising up from his intuition, and because light, being empty of the reflection of the essence of Speech, does not illuminate.[446]

In the *IPVV*, approximately at the same place among the introductory passages, Abhinava praises *pratibhā* as the *Gāyatrī*:

And in [Speech], **this**: just as the observable universe consisting of Speech, whose single body is verbalization in virtue of being pierced by experiences (*saṃvedana*) in the form of object-awareness (*parāmarśa*) characterized by a cognitive content (*pramiti*), blooms forth in stages, namely, an expectancy to opening up in the *paśyantī* state, the blossoming forth in the *madhyamā* state, the expansion (i.e., full bloom) in the *vaikharī* state as that which is being distinctively (*prathaktayā*)

445 Ibid, p. 94.

446 *IPV*, vol. 1., 1.1., p. 23.

objectified; just so, the *Gāyatrī* which is set above as the impeller in the form of intuition is the sunlight of knowledge ever arising in one's own heart, skilled in creations....

Therefore, at the time of performing a ritual action, the triad, characterized by the *Ṛg, Yajur, and Sāma,* and their ensemble, bloom forth in a state in which the priestliness of the Hotṛ, Adhvaryu, Udgātṛ and Brāhman is to be made vivid. Thus, its cause--a variety of things that are ordinary and fruitful, and scriptural--is stated as the substantiating example. Or, indeed, the *Gāyatrī* shines forth in the triad consisting of internal things and so on, and beyond in the triad consisting of *paśyantī* and so on. Or, the inward *Oṃ* which consists in an injunction of the syllable *Oṃ* in our mind is the triad, the *Ṛg* and so on. By this sight, which is the same as the syllable *Oṃ,*

"Unaccompanied by *Oṃ,* it proceeds at first and wastes away afterward," (*Manusmṛti* 2.74).

and this,

"All the Veda...," (*Kāśikāvṛtti* 2.15)

in [these passages], [it is said stated] that the *Gāyatrī* in the form of intuition at the beginning of an undertaking is the blooming forth in stages. For, this intuition becoming the sound itself in the *Sāma* s, whose form is music; becoming the string in the form of purpose, namely, the praising of the actions, the *guṇa,* and the gods; it becomes vividly manifested in the *Yajur,* as the duty. The Veda is an instruction because it causes one to know what should be known, whose means are *dharma* and so on, with certainty. In the same way, the *Recognition of the Lord,* which is the heart made manifest (*sphuritahṛdaya*) will be revealed in this *Vivṛti*....

This has been stated: Just as the world exists without differentiation in the ultimate Speech substance, differentiation being strung together in *paśyantī;* differentiation being revealed in *madhyamā;* and an appearance of differentiation becoming vivid as different objectified forms in *Vaikharī,* just so, it ordains different purposeful activities for different qualified people. Just so, in the place of the ultimate Speech substance, the perception of the author who is one with Śiva is the ultimate substance, being self-same with [Śiva]; it is expressed by the word "heart" because it is the substance (*sāratvāt*). It exists in the *sūtra* by the stringing together of different parts whose vibrant

> manifestation is characterized by a fitness to become the highest object to be achieved by people....
>
> But those of erroneous views arising from frequenting other shores, their delusions of such sort dispelled, their hearts at rest in the meaning of the verses and their commentary through the subcommentary in the form of a *vivṛti*. Gradually, through a repose in a constant meditation of the meanings of the verses, just as they succeed in being of an essence not different from the supreme heart in the form of the author's perceptions (*śāstrakārasaṃvedanarūpaparahṛdayāvibhaktatattvatayā*), just so, in intuition itself the bundle of duties realized in the commencement and termination of an action in stages, is the cause of success of all worldly activities. Thus, the awakening to the self, which rests in the heart of the teacher and becomes manifest gradually in the verses, and so on, comes into manifestation by accomplishing without a doubt or an argument what ought to be accomplished."[447]

Abhinava puts this sentiment to words with respect to his own commentarial work, the *Locana* which he must have conceived as an unfolding of an intuition that proceeds to its culmination in a clearly and vividly manifested form. Each *uddyota* ends with a concluding verse dedicated to *pratibhā*, *paśyantī*, *madhyamā*, and *vaikharī* respectively.[448] He praises *pratibhā* with the following verse:

> I praise the goddess Śivā,
> God's blessed *śakti* of understanding,
> who resides within her own self and who,
> by the power which awakens within her
> wakes instantly the universe.[449]

---

447 *IPVV* 1.1, p. 15-16. "*tasyāṃ ca 'etat' iti paridṛśyamānaṃ vāṅmayaṃ... tat parapratipādyajanaviṣayatāpattiyogyatālakṣaṇasphuraṇātmakabhedāsūtraṇayā sthitaṃ sūtre.*"

448 See translation in Ingalls, et al., trs., *DhāL*, pp. 199, 366, 674, 725.

449 *DhāL*, Ingalls, et al., trs., p. 199. These four benedictory verses are found in

When we look again to his works in poetics, it seems to have been an especially fortuitous coincidence that Ānandavardhana began speaking of poetry as a communication of hearts, and that the poet's intuition and imagination are fullfilled in the heart of the sensitive audience. There is little doubt that many of Abhinava's reflections on an aesthetic experience and the unity of the audience's imagination colored his perceptions of ritual and philosophy: we see that Abhinava's conceptions in poetics and religious philosophy, of the *kavi-sahṛdaya* bond linked by their creative imagination (*pratibhā*) and of *Śiva-jīva* (*pati-paśu*) bond linked by the goddess (*pratibhā devī*), are mutually and equally influencing. A unique turn of mind into the philosophy of reflection, *bimbapratibimba,* and the ubiquitous use of the mirror imagery, may well have developed from the reciprocity between the poet and actor as the creator, who is re-created in turn by the members of the audience.[450] The devotional fervor which in Śaivism, and

---

VSS 97. pp. 172, 310, 603, 556. "I praise intuition, the goddess *Śivā,* reposing on the basis of herself; by whose power of awakening alone, instantly the world awakens." "I, Abhinavagupta, praise her who beholds this world, by whom abundant reality is strung differentiatedly as it blossoms forth." "I praise the supreme goddess, the Middle One, beloved of the Three-eyed, who grants that the divisions strung become vividly clear." "I praise the fourth power who sees objects of direct perception, granting that the flowing outwardly into a marvellous variety of things is made vivid." (my translations) Cf. n. 448 and text. Abhinava's descriptions and schema of the four goddesses, representing levels of speech (Speech), is the same in the *Locana* and *IPVV.*

[450] The commingling of philosophy and poetics in the notion of *pratibhā* is clearly seen in the first pages of the *Abh,* as Abhinavagupta glosses the first verse of the *NŚ,* "*kaver api svahṛdayāyatanasatatoditapratibhābhidhānaparavāgdevatānugrahotthita-vicitrāpūrvanirmāṇaśaktiśālinaḥ prajāpater iva kāmajanitajagataḥ*" *Abh I,* Nagar ed., p. 4. "even of the poet whose great power to create original and wonderful things arises from the grace of the supreme deity of speech called intuition (*pratibhā*) ever arising from the basis of his own heart, as of Prajāpati by whom the world is created at will."

Tantrism in general, is expressible as an identity (*tādātmya, samāveśa*) with the Lord, in Abhinava extols human agency and purpose equally. Whatever the world may be, it is seen in a reflection and through the reflection of the individuals' soul. Whatever has been taught comes to fruition in the vividness of the individuals' contemplation of the foundations of one's thoughts and feelings.

In Bhartṛhari's thought, intuition is placed above polemical and logical reasoning as the means of knowledge because of its connections with language which reaches deeply into individual's conscious and sub-conscious mind, widely into the roots that are tradition, and transcendently into an underlying reality of Brahman. On this foundation, Abhinava richly adds ideas of creativity and mastery that arise out of the intuitive. *Pratibhā* is luminous as the becoming that unfolds in varied and marvellous stages to its completion. The endless universe is born from *devī pratibhā,* who is the fullfillment of the Lord's desires, "*icchātvaṃ asya sā hi sisṛkṣoḥ prapadyate.*"[451] And endless universes are born from the intuition of the poet who is god in his world, and from the sympathetic spectators and readers who are also creators in their own right. Each human, being the illuminator like Śiva, is the author of his/her world of thought and imagination.

The theater is a universe in itself, and conversely the universe is a theater of countless spectators enacting it each from his/her own perspective. And from that perspective, as the lord and master of his own thought and imagination, an individual's surest counsel is the heart's

451 *TĀ* 1.2 commentary, Dwivedi and Rastogi, eds., vol. 2., p. 16.

prescience that guides him in thought, speech, and action, as the *Gāyatrī* unfolds in the ensemble and performance of the *Ṛg, Sāma,* and *Yajur,* and the poet's intuition is carried out in the mental, vocal, and bodily performance of the actor, ending in the audience's empathetic reception. Abhinava's concept of this noumenon, which makes an aesthetic experience intense, sublime, joyful and finally purifying, also makes the theater the proper means of right and purposeful action. His persistent concern that it should be a place of delightful instruction is heard in the *Abhinavabhāratī,* "Does it teach in the manner of a teacher? No, he says. But, rather, it increases the intellect. It bestows one's own intuition of this kind. This is the meaning. And intuition is not wrong, he says. **The good**: because it begets intuitions of the good. He states the cause in this regard: because it does not depart from *dharma.*"[452]

[452] *Abh* 1, Nagar ed., vol. 1, p. 39. "*nanu kiṃ guruvad upadeśaṃ karoti. nety āha. kintu buddhiṃ vivardhayati. svapratibhām eva tādṛśīṃ vitaratīty arthaḥ. na ca sā duṣṭā pratibhety āha--hitam-- hitapratibhājanakatvāt. atra hetum āha--yato dharmād anapetam.*"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Literature

Abhinavagupta. *Abhinavabhāratī.* See Bharata, *Nāṭyaśāstra.*

____________. *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī of Abhinavagupta: Doctrine of Divine Recognition.* Sanskrit Text with the Commentary of Bhāskarī. 3 vols. Vols. 1, 2, edited by Subramania Iyer and K. C. Pandey; vol. 3 translated by K. C. Pandey. The Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana 70, 1938; 83, 1950; 84, 1954. Repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986.

____________. *The Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī.* 3 vols. Edited by Madhusūdan Kaul Shāstrī. Repr. Delhi: Akay Book Corporation 1987.

____________. *Locana.* See Ānandavardhana, *Dhvanyāloka.*

____________. *Le Paramārthasāra.* Texte Sanskrit Édité et traduit par LilianeSilburn. Publications del'institut de civilisation Indienne, serie 8 fasc. 5. Paris: E. De Boccard, editeur, 1967.

____________. *Parātṛṃśikāvivaraṇa: The Secret of Tantric Mysticism.* Translated, annotated and commented by Jaideva Singh. Sanskrit text edited and annotated by Swami Lakshman Jee. Edited by Bettina Bäumer. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988.

____________. *Tantrāloka.* Vols 1-8. With the commentary of Jayaratha. Edited by R. C. Dwived and Navjivan Rastogi. Enlarged ed., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987 (1st ed., KSTS, 1918-1938).

____________. *Tantrasāra of Abhinavagupta.* Edited with notes by Mukunda Ram Sastri. Repr. Delhi: Bani Prakasham, 1983 (1st ed., KSTS 17, 1918).

____________. *Tantravaṭadhānika.* Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 24. Edited with notes by Pt. Mukund Rām Shāstrī. Bombay: Nirnayasagar Press, 1918.

Ānandavardhana. *Dhvanyāloka.* With the *Locana* commentary of Abhinavagupta, the *Bālapriyā* subcommentary of Sahṛdayarāmaṣāraka, and the *Divyāñjana* notes of Pt. Mahadevaśāstrī. Edited by Pt. Mahādeva Śāstrī. Kashi Sanskrit Series 135 (Alaṅkāra Section, No. 5). Benares: Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series Office, 1940.

————————. *Dhvanyāloka.* With the *Locana* commentary of Abhinavagupta and the *Prakāśa* Hindi translation of both texts by Jagannath Paṭhak. Vidyabhavan Sanskrit Granthamala 97. Benares: Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, 1965.

Bharata. *Nāṭyaśāstra.* With the *Abhinavabhāratī* commentary of Abhinavagupta. 4 vols. Edited by Manavalli Ramakrishna Kavi. Gaekwad Oriental Series 36, 68, 124, 145. Baroda: Oriental Institute, vol. 1, 1926; vol. 2, 1934; vol. 3, 1954; vol. 4, 1964.

————. *Nāṭyśāstra of Bharatamuni.* With the commentary *Abhinavabhāratī* of Abhinavaguptacharya. 4 vols. Edited by R. S. Nagar. Parimal Sanskrit Series 4. Delhi: Parimal Publications, 2d ed. vol. 1, 1988 [1st ed. date unknown]; 2d ed. vol. 2, 1984 [1st ed. 1983]; vol. 4, 1984.

Bhartṛhari. *Śatakatrayam.* With the gloss of Mahābalopāhva kṛṣṇaśāstri. 2d ed., Bombay: Nirnayasagar Press, 1981.

Bhartṛhari. *Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari, Kāṇḍa I.* With the *Vṛtti* and the *Paddhati* of Vṛṣabhadeva. Critically edited by K. A. Subramania Iyer. Deccan College Monograph Series 32. Poona: Deccan College Post graduate and Research Institute, 1966.

————. *Vākyapadīyam, Part I (Brahma-Kāṇḍam).* With the *Svopajñavṛtti* of Harivriṣabha and the *Ambākartrī* of Raghunātha Śarmā. Sarasvatī Granthamālā 91. Varanasi: Sampurnananda Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1976.

————. *Vākyapadīya Brahmakāṇḍa.* With the *vṛtti* of Harivṛṣabha, text reproduced from the Lahore edition. Translated, introduced and annotated by Madeleine Biardeau. Publications de l'institut de civilisation indienne, série in-8, fasc. 24. Paris: Édition E. De Boccard, 1964.

———. *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari with the Vṛtti, Chapter 1.* Translated by K. A. Subramnia Iyer. Deccan college Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series 26. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1965.

———. *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari, Kāṇḍa II.* English Translation with Exegetical Notes. Translated by K. A. Subramania Iyer. 1st ed., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1977.

———. *Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari, Kāṇḍa 2.* With the *Ṭīkā* of Puṇyarāja and the Ancient Vṛtti. Edited by K. A. Subramania Iyer. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

Bhāmaha. *Kāvyālaṃkāra of Bhāmaha.* Edited with English translation and notes by P. V. Naganatha Sastry. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.

Chatterji, J.C. *Kashmir Shavaism.* Delhi: Parimal Publications, 1987.

Daṇḍin. *Daṇḍin's Poetik (kāvjādarśa).* Sanskrit and German. Edited by Otto Böhtlingk. Leipzig: Verlag von H. Haessel, 1890.

Dharmakīrti. *Nyāyabindu.* With the *Ṭīkā* of Dharmottara. Kāshi Sanskrit Series 22 (Haridas Sanskrit Granthamālā) (Buddhist Nyāya Section No. 1.). Benares: Jayakrishna Dass Gupta, 1924.

Hume, Robert Ernest, tr. *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads.* With an outline of the philosophy of the Upanishads and an annotated bibliography. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.

Jaimini. *Mīmāṃsādarśana* 1.1.2-2.1.1. With the *Bhāṣya* of Śabara and the *Tantravārtika* commentary of Kumārilabhaṭṭa. Edited by Vaidyanāthaśāstrī. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 97. Pooṇa: Ānandāśrama Press, 1929.

Jhalakīkar, Bhīmācārya. *Nyāyakośa.* Revised and re-edited by Vāsudev Shāstrī Abhyankar. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 69. Poona: The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1978.

Ingalls, Daniel H. H., Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson, and M. V. Patwardhan, trs. *The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandvardhana with the Locana of Abhinavagupta.* Edited with introduction by Daniel H. H. Ingalls. Harvard Oriental Series 49. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Kalhaṇa. *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī: A Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmīr.* Translated, with an introduction, commentary, & Appendices by M. A. Stein. Vols. 1-3. Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1961, 1979 (1st ed. 1900)

Kallaṭa. *Spanda-Kārikās: The Divine Creative Pulsation.* With the *Spanda-nirṇaya* Commentary of Kṣemarāja. Translated by Jaideva Singh. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980.

Krishnamoorthy, K. *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana.* Critically edited with introduction, translation and notes. With a Foreword by K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar. 2d ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982 (1st ed. 1974).

Kumārilabhaṭṭa. *Ślokavārttika.* Translated by Gangānātha Jha. Repr. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1985 (1st published 1908).

Kuntaka. *Vakroktijīvita.* Critically edited with Variants, Introduction and English translation by K. Krishnamoorthy. Dharwad: Karnatak University, Dharwad, 1977.

Lakṣmī Tantra: A Pāñcarātra Text. Translated and annotated by Sanjukta Gupta. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

Pātañjalayogasūtrāṇi. With the *Bhāṣya* of Vyāsa and the *Ṭīkā* of Vācaspatimiśra. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 47. Poona: Ānandāśrama Press, 1904.

Ruyyaka. *Alaṃkārasarvasva.* With the *Ṭīkā* of of Jayaratha. Edited by Pt. Durgāparasād and Pt. Kāśīnārh Śarma. Kāvyamālā 35. Bombay: Nirṇayasārgar, 1893.

Somānanda. *The Śivadṛṣṭi.* With the *Vṛtti of Utpaladeva.* Edited with a Sanskrit commentary and Hindi translation by Radheshyam Chaturvedi. Benares: Varanaseya Sanskrit Sansthan, 1986.

Śrīmaddvaipāyanapraṇītabrahmasūtrāṇi. Part 1. With the *bhāṣya* of Saṅkara and the *ṭīkā* of Ānandagiri. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 21. Poona: Ānandāśrama Printing Press, 1890.

Udbhaṭa. *Kāvyākaṃkārasārasaṃgraha of Udbhaṭa.* With the *Laghuvṛtti* Commentary of Indurāja. Edited, introduced and annotated by Narayana Daso Banhatti. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 79. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1925.

______. *Kāvyālaṅkārasārasaṅgraha of Udbhaṭa.* With the ' *Vivṛti.* ' Critically edited with introduction and indexes by K.S. Ramaswami Sastri Siromani. Gaekwad Oriental Series 55. Baroda: Oriental Instituted, 1931.

Utpaladeva. *Īśvarapratyabhijñā of Utpaladeva.* Vol. 1 & 2. With the *Vimarśinī* commentary of Abhinavagupta. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 22, 33. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1918, 1921.

______. *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā of Utpaladeva.* Parts 1 & 2. Translated with explanations and notes by R. K. Kaw. Sharada Peetha Indological Research Series 12. Sharada Peetha Research Centre: Karan Nagar, Srinagar, 1975.

Utpaladeva. *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikavṛtti.* Edited with Notes by Pt. Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 34. Government of Kashmir: Srinagar, 1921.

Vasugupta. *Śiva Sūtras: The Yoga of Supreme Identity.* With the *Vimarśinī* Commentary of Kṣemarājā. Translated with introduction, notes, exposition, glossary and index by Jaideva Singh. Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982 (1st edition 1979).

Vāmana. *The Kāvyālaṃkārasūtras of Vāmana.* With his own *Vṛtti.* Edited by Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Kāvyamālā 15. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, 1889.

Vijñānabhairava: Or Divine Consciousness. Translated with notes, exposition, introduction and glossary by Jaideva Singh. Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981 (1st ed. Delhi, 1979).

Yāska. *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta: The Oldest Indian Treatise on Etymology, Philology, and Semantics.* Edited, translated, with introduction, notes, indices and appendices, by Laksman Sarup. Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967, 1984 (1st ed. 1920-1927).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Secondary Literature

Alper, Harvey P. "*Svabhāvam Avabhāsasya Vimarśam:* Judgement as a Transcendental Category in Utpaladeva's Śaiva Theology." *Brahmavidyā: The Adyar Library Bulletin* 51 (1987): 176-241.

Biardeau, Madeleine. *Théorie de la connaissance et philsophie de la parole dans le brahmanisme classique.* Le Monde d'outre-mer passé et Présent, première série, 23. Paris: Mouton & co., 1964.

Bühler, Georg. *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS Made in Kaśmīr, Rajaputana, and Central India.* Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, extra number. Bombay: Society's Library, Town Hall. London: Trübner & Co., 57& 59 Ludgate Hill. Williams & Northgate, 14 Henrietta Street.

Carpenter, David. "Revelation and Experience in Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunst Südasien* 29 (1985) 185-206.

Chari, V. K. "*Lokadharmī* and *Nāṭyadharmī*" *Brahmavidyā: The Adyar Library Bulletin* 49 (1985): 79-96.

________. *Sanskrit Criticism.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990.

Coward, Harold G. *Sphoṭa Theory of Language.* Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986 (1st edition, 1980).

______________. "The Yoga of the Word (*Sabdapūrvayoga*)" *Brahmavidyā*: *The Adyar Library Bulletin* 49 (1985): 1-13.

De, Sushil Kumar. *History of Sanskrit Poetics.* 2 vols in one. Repr. of 2d edition, Calcutta: Firma KLM Private limited, 1976 (1st ed. 1923, 1925).

Dwivedi, R. C., ed. *Principles of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit.* Benares: Motilal Banarsidass, 1969.

Dyczkowski, Mark. "Self-Awareness, Own Being and Egoity." An unpublished paper, 1989.

Franklin Edgerton, tr. *Mīmāṃsā Nyāya Prakāśa. Or Āpadevī: a Treatise on the Mīmāṃsā System by Āpadeva.* 2d. ed. Delhi: Srisatguru Publications, 1986 (1st ed. 1929).

Gajendragadkar, A. B., and R. D. Karmarkar, eds. and trs. *The Arthasaṃgraha of Laugākṣi Bhāskara.* Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984 (1st ed., 1934).

Gerow, Edwin. *A Glossary of Indian Figures of Speech.* Mouton: The Hague, 1971.

Gerow, Edwin. *Indian Poetics.* In *A History of Indian Literature,* vol. 5, fasc. 3, Jan Gonda, general ed. Wiesebaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977.

Gnoli, Raniero. *The Aesthetic Experience According to Abhinavagupta.* Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies, vol. 62. 3rd Indian ed., Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1985. (1st ed. Serie Orientale Roma, vol.11, Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1956)

____________. *Udbhaṭa's Commentary on the Kāvyālaṃkāra of Bhāmaha.* Serie Orientale Roma, vol. 27. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1962.

Gonda, Jan. *The Vision of the Vedic Poets.* 1st Indian edition Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd, 1984 (1st published as vol. 8 in Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae, 1963).

Gupta, D. K. "Concept of Bhāvika in Sanskrit Poetics," In *Journal of the Oriental Institute,* vol. 32, ns. 1-2 (Sept.-Dec. 1982): 54-60. Baroda: University of Baroda.

Gupta, Manjul. *A Study of Abhinavabhāratī on Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra and Avaloka on Dhanañjaya's Daśarūpaka (Dramaturgical Principles).* Delhi: Gian Publishing House, 1987

Hattori, Masaaki. *Diṅnāga on Perception : the Pratyakṣapariccheda of Diṅnāga's pramāṇasamuccaya from the Sanskrit fragments in the Tibetan versions.* HOS 47. Cambridge, Mass: Havard University Press, 1968.

Hattori, Masaaki. "*Apoha* and *Pratibhā.*" In *Sanskrit and Indian Studies,* edited by Masatoshi Nagatomi, et al., 61-73. Holland D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1979.

Iyer, K. A. Subramania. *Bhartṛhari : A Study of the Vākyapadīya in the Light of the Ancient Commentaries.* Building Centennary and Silver Jubilee Series 68. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1969.

____________________."Bhartṛhari on the Primary & Secondary Meanings of words." *Indian Linguistics* 29 (1968) 97-112. Kartre Felicitation Volume, Part 1.

____________________, tr. *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari with the Vṛtti. Chapter 1.* Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series 26. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1969.

____________________. *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari, Chapter 2.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1977.

Jha, Ganganatha. *The Prābhākara School of Pūrva Mīmāṃsā.* Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1978 (1st ed. Allahabad, 1911).

_______________. *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā in its Sources.* With a Critical Bibliography by Dr. Umesha Mishra. Benares: Benares Hindu University, 1942.

Kane, P. V. *History of Sanskrit Poetics.* Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987 (4th ed. 1971).

Larson, Gerald James. 'The Aesthetic (*Rasāsvāda*) and the Religious (*Brahmāsvāda*) in Abhinavagupta's Kashmir Saivism," *Philosophy East and West* 26.4 (Oct '76) 371-87.

Lienhard, Siegfried. *A History of Classical poetry: Sanskrit-Pali-Prakrit.* In *A History of Indian Literature,* Vol. 2, Fasc. 1, Jan Gonda, general ed. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1984.

Masson, J. L. "Authorship Problem of the *Dhvanyāloka.*" In *Sanskrit and Indian Studies,* edited by Masatoshi Nagatomi, et al., 11-32. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Co, 1980.

__________. "The *Dhvanyāloka* and the *Dhvanyālokalocana:* A Translation of the Fourth *Uddyota,* Parts 1 and 2. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 97.3 (1977): 285-304; 97-4 (1977) 423-440.]

__________. "Philosophy and Literary Criticism in Ancient India. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 1 (1971) 167-180.

__________. "Truth and Falsity in Poetry." *Annals of the Journal of Baroda Oriental Institute,* vol. 60 (parts 1-14): 225-228.

__________ and M. V. Patwardhan. *Aesthetic Rapture: The Rasādhyāya of the Nāṭyaśāstra.* Vols. 1 and 2. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1970.

Muller-Ortega, Paul E. *The Triadic Heart of Śiva: Kaula Tantricism of Abhinavagupta in the Non-Dual Shaivism of Kashmir*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1989.

Nagatomi, Masatoshi. "*Mānasa-pratyaksa:* A Conundrum in the Buddhist *Pramāṇa* System." In *Sanskrit and Indian Studies,* edited by Masatoshi Nagatomi, et al., 243-260. Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing Company, 1979.

Jean Naudou. *Les Bouddhistes Kaśmīriens au Moyen Age.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968.

Padoux, André. *Recherches sur la symbolique et l'énergie de la parole dans certaines textes tantriques.* [PICI 21]. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1963.

Pandey, Kanti Chandra. *Comparative Aesthetics*, Vol. 1: *Indian Aesthetics*. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 2. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1950.

Raghavan, V. "The History of Bhāvika in Sanskrit Poetics." *Indian Historical Quarterly* 14 (1938): 787-798.

__________. *The Number of Rasa*-s. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1967.

__________. *Some Concepts of Alaṃkāra Śāstra*. Repr. Madras: The Adyar Library, 1973 (1st ed. 1942).

Raja, K. Kunjunni. *The Language of Poetry*. Extension Lectures Publications Series 29. Dharwad: Karnatak University, 1978.

__________. *Indian Theories of Meaning*. Repr. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1977 (1st ed. 1963, 2nd ed. 1969).

Rastogi, Navijivan. *The Krama Tantricism of Kashmir*. Vol. 1. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979.

__________. "Some More Nyāyas as Employed by Abhinavagupta." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 65 (1984) 27-42.

__________. "Theory of Error According to Abhinavagupta." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 14 (1986) 1-33.

__________. "Recognition in *Pratiyabhijñā* School: A Study in Epistemology" *ABORI* 58-59 (1977-78): 841-861. Diamond Jubilee Volume. Edited by R. N. Dandekar and G. K. Bhat. Poona: BORI, 1978.

Ruegg, David Seyfort. *Contributions a 'histoire de la philosophie linguistique Indienne*. Publication de l'institut de civilisation Indienne, série 8, fascicule 7. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1959.

Sanderson, Alexis. "Maṇḍala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir." In *Mantras et diagrammes rituels dans l'Hindouisme*.

Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 1986.

________________ "Purity and Power Among the Brahmans of Kashmir" In *The Category of the Persons: Anthropological and Philosophical Perspectives.* Edited by Steven Lukes, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

________________ "Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions." In *The World's Religions.* Edited by Stewart Sutherland et al. London: Routledge, 1988.

Sreekantaiya, T. N. "'Imagination' in Indian Poetics.' *Indian Historical Quarterly* Vol. 13, no. 1 (March, 1937): 59-83.

Śarma, Sulekhacandra. *Bhaṭṭanāyaka aur Abhinavagupta kī sādhāraṇīkaraṇaviṣayaka Avadhāraṇā.* Delhi: Devavani Parishad, 1982.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics.* Introduction by Jonathan Culier. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye in collaboration with Albert Reidlinger. Translated from the French by Wade Baskin. Great Britain: William Collins Sons and Co. Ltd Glasgow. (1st British Commonwealth ed. 1960).

Stcherbatsky, F. Th. *Buddhist Logic.* Two volumes. Republication, London, England: Dover, 1962 (1st published, 1930)

Tola, Fernando and Carmen Dragonetti. "Some Remarks on Bhartṛhari's Concept of *Pratibhā*." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 18 (1990):95-112.

Tubb, Gary A. "Śāntarasa in the *Mahābharata.*" In *Journal of South Asian Literature,* xx.1. (Winter/Spring 1985), pp. 141-68.